

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

APRIL, 1909.

No. 2.

THE INFALLIBLE POPE.

"The historian is seen at his best
when he does not appear."

The Romanist Klee in his *Dogmatics*, vol. 1, p. 210, called it a Protestant slander that Catholics thought the Pope infallible. (Hase I, p. 277.) The Scotch Catholic Father Keenan in his *Controversial Catechism* says of the Pope's infallibility: "This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith." Since 1870 this damaging statement has been quietly dropped, and no hint given that the text differs from the author's own editions of 1846 and 1853. (Sidney, p. 86.)

In the "Form of Oath and Declaration," taken in 1793 by all Irish Catholics, occur the words: "I also declare that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible." And a Synod of Irish Bishops in 1810 declared this oath and declaration to be "a constituent part of the Roman Catholic religion." (Quirinus, p. 189.) Archbishop Murray, Bishop Doyle, and others in 1824 and 1825 before both houses of Parliament swore, "that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are Catholics bound to believe, that popes are infallible." (B. W.-A., p. 270.)

On July 18, 1870, Pope Pius IX decreed: "We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed; that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks 'ex cathedra,' that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doc-

trine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church." (Vat. Coun., ch. 4, On the Infallibility.)

When Alexander the Great sent word to the Athenians that he had become a god, they cried out, "If Alexander really wished to be a god, he was one." When Pope Pius IX had set his heart on being declared infallible, the Catholic bishops in 1870 let him declare himself infallible. Psaphon of Alexandria taught a lot of parrots to scream, "Great is the God Psaphon!" and then let them fly to carry over land and sea the fame of his godhead. Pope Pius IX called the Catholic bishops to Rome and told them he was infallible, and then let them go into the world to preach that he is infallible.

When Pope Boniface VIII said every creature must obey the Pope or be damned, one of the complaints was, "Boniface must have a family devil, since he lays claim to being infallible, a thing which is impossible without sorcery." (Hase I, p. 267.)

In 1388 Aquinas's infallibility of the Pope was distinctly declared heresy by the faculty of the High School of Toulouse, the first and most influential theological corporation of the Church. (Janus, p. 275.)

Pope Urban VIII, 1623—1644, when confronted with an objection from the Decretals of his predecessors, said, "The decision of one living Pope is worth more than that of a hundred dead ones."

Pope Benedict XIV, 1740—1758, said laughingly, "If it is true that all justice and all truth lie hidden in the shrine of my breast, yet I have never been able to find the key of it." (Hase I, p. 276 f.)

When the historian Platina asked for clear documentary

evidence, Pope Paul II (1464—1471) smote upon his breast as the source of all right. (Hase I, p. 268.)

Pope Boniface VIII said, "The Pope holds all rights locked up in his breast;" Pope Pius IX said, "La tradizione son io—I am the Tradition." (Quirinus, pp. 713. 715.)

Pope Pius IX said, "As to Infallibility, I believed it as plain Abbe Mastai, and now, as Pope Mastai, I *feel* it." (Q., p. 132. Hase I, p. 294.)

The Irish Bishop Keane of Cloyne said St. Peter brought the whole body of tradition with him to Rome well stored up; here, and here alone, it was still kept, and every Pope took what was required from the stock which he possessed as a whole genuine and entire. (Q., p. 741.)

Theologians had actually given twenty-five different explanations of what was required for an *ex cathedra* decision. Manning had propounded, whenever the Pope "intends to require the assent of the whole Church," he is infallible. Cardinal Schwarzenberg pointed out with pungent irony the saying of Boniface VIII that the Pope holds all rights locked up in his breast. And thus it must be assumed of Manning's theory that the Pope holds in his own mind all doctrines, present and future. This is just the opinion of Pius IX. Everyone will be taught that not only all rights, as Boniface VIII said, but all religious and moral truths, are drawn forth by the Pope from the recesses of his own breast. (Q., pp. 458. 522.)

Bishop Ketteler of Mainz said it was the greatest absurdity to believe "all tradition reposed in the shrine of the Pope's bosom." (Q., p. 740.)

La Chaise and Le Tellier, his confessor, explained to Louis XIV that the Jansenists were worse than atheists. The *Civiltà* says the fallibilists are more dangerous to "the cause of God" than atheists. (Q., p. 656.)

Louis XIV said to his son, "As God's representatives we have part in the divine knowledge as well as the divine authority." The Pope practically says the same.

Voltaire invented for Louis XIV the saying, "I am the State." Pius IX practically said, "I am the Church."

Since 1870 the Pope — Church = the Pope + the Church, and, therefore, the Church = 0. Bishop Maret said, "From henceforth it will be necessary to chant, 'I believe in the Pope,' instead of, 'I believe in the Church.' (Sidney, p. 277.) Father Klinckowstrom, the friend of Moehler, said, "Faith [in the Pope] is the sole needful illumination." (Hase II, p. 439.)

The Vatican Council has simplified the Bible and the Creed. They have reduced the Bible to the text: "Thou art Peter;" and the Creed to one article: "I believe in the Pope."

The Catholic Doellinger wrote that a Romanist must say, "I believe, because the Pope, declared to be infallible, directs that it be taught and believed. But that he is infallible I believe, because he asserts it of himself." (Hase I, p. 283.)

A cardinal said of the bishops favoring the infallibility, "If the Pope ordered them to believe and teach four instead of three Persons in the Trinity, they would obey." (Q., p. 83.)

Editor Veuillot of the *Univers* was edified by the prayer of a young girl: "Holy Mother of God, the Pope has made thee immaculate: do thou make him infallible." (Hase I, p. 295.)

Bishop Pie of Poitiers said the Pope must be infallible, because Peter was crucified head downwards. As the head bears the whole weight of the body, so the Pope, as head, bears the whole Church; but he is infallible who bears, not he who is borne. (Q. E. D.) The Italians and Spaniards applauded enthusiastically. A Sicilian prelate, Archbishop Natoli of Messina, said they had sent an embassy to the Virgin Mary to ask if she had heard of Peter's infallibility, to which she replied that she certainly remembered being present, when her Son conferred this special prerogative on him. (Speech delivered in the Council Hall, May 14, 1870. Quirinus, pp. 532. 533. 695.)

Bishop d'Avanzo said, "In the Pope the Spirit of God lives and acts, therefore the Pope, led by this Spirit, cannot

err." And the Patriarch Ballerini said, "Were we to let personal infallibility drop, we should destroy the obedience due to the Pope and exalt ourselves against God Himself." (Quirinus, pp. 720. 721.)

The *Civiltà Cattolica*, the official organ of the Pope, declares that the Pope continues Christ's work on earth, and is to us what Christ would be if He were visibly present as our ruler. (1868, vol. 3, p. 259.) The same journal says: "As the Jews were formerly God's people, so are the Romans under the New Covenant. They have a supernatural dignity." (1862, vol. 3, p. 11.)

Louis Veuillot says (p. 149 of his *L'illusion Liberale*): "We all know certainly only one thing, that is, that no man knows anything except the Man with whom God is for ever, the Man who carries the thought of God. We must . . . unswervingly follow his inspired directions." The *Univers* in October, 1869, applied to Pius IX the word of St. Paul in which Christ is said to be "much higher than the heavens." Father Faber speaks of the Pope as a quasi-incarnation of God: "The Sovereign Pontiff is the third visible presence of Jesus Christ amongst us. . . . He is the visible shadow which emanates from the invisible Head of the Church in the Holy Sacrament." The Roman Catholic Abbe Gratry complains: "We find madmen in the nineteenth century . . . teaching: that the Pope is the Eucharist; the Pope is the Holy Spirit; that the Pope has the right to say, 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life,'" and he characterizes "this foolish and culpable tendency" as "contempt of the Gospel and of our Lord Jesus Christ." The Roman Catholic Dupanloup denounced this "Romanism gone mad." "When the Pope thinks, it is God who meditates in him." (W. R. Carson, *Reunion Essays*, pp. 78 to 80.)

Since the Pope is infallible, it is both absurd and blasphemous even to advise him, said Lamennais. "I have read in the *Diario di Roma* the advice of M. de Chateaubriand to the Holy Ghost. At any rate the Holy Ghost is fully warned;

and if he makes a mistake this time, it will not be the ambassador's fault." Lamennais, when condemned, submitted, not because he was in error, but because Catholics had no right to defend the Church against the supreme will even of an erring Pontiff. He was persuaded that his silence would injure religion; yet he deemed it his duty to be silent. He had ceased to believe that the Pope could not err, but he still believed that he could not lawfully be disobeyed. He wrote that the Pope seemed careful not to omit any blunder that could secure his annihilation. The Pope had so zealously embraced the cause of antichristian despotism as to sacrifice to it the religion of which he was the chief. (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, pp. 464 to 466.)

Thomas of Vio, or Cajetan, was the first to hold Papal Infallibility in its fullness; he invented the saying, "The Catholic Church is the born handmaid of the Pope," — he who had seen a Sixtus IV, an Innocent VIII, an Alexander VI. (Janus, p. 374.)

Bishop Ketteler of Mainz attacked Cajetan's theory that Peter alone had an "ordinary power," to be transmitted to his successors, while the "special power" of the other apostles expired with them; so that the bishops are not the successors of the apostles, but derive all power from the Pope. (Q., p. 740.)

The Vatican Council lasted many months, and it was a heavy drain on the Pope's purse, his boarders costing him every day 25,000 francs. (Q., p. 242.) And Pius punned, "Unless I shall soon be infallible, I shall fail."

At the Synod of Constantinople, in 859, the bishops were induced to vote to depose Synesius by promising each of them separately the throne of the Patriarch. Similar tactics were employed in Rome in 1870. Darboy of Paris drily replied, "Not having a cold in the head, I have no particular need of a hat" (of a Cardinal). (Q., p. 123.)

Pachymeres relates that when the people of Constantinople demanded a Council in 1282 to judge Bekkus, the unionist Patriarch, it was said by Bishop Theoktistus of Adrianople

that they treated bishops like wooden spits on which Bekkus might be roasted, and which might then be thrown into the fire. At the Vatican Council the opponents of infallibility were treated shamefully, some with brutality. Veuillot said it was right to deprive the bishops of the freedom of evil. (Q., pp. 749. 283.)

Lord Acton writes: "Some of the most distinguished of the prelates characterized it (the Vatican Council) as a 'conspiracy against Divine truth and right,' 'a disgrace for all Catholics.'" (Van Dyke, p. 134.) Again, "The knowledge that the Vatican Council was a long intrigue, carried through with craft and violence, made its way through the world."

The Orator Ekebolius cried out to the Emperor Julian, "Only trample us under your feet, the salt that has lost its savor." (Q., p. 152.) The Catholic bishops in 1870 might well have said the same to the Pope.

Bishop Maret of Sura, President of the Paris Theological Faculty, said, either the Council was to give the Pope an infallibility he did not yet possess, in which case the donor was higher than the receiver by divine and therefore inalienable rights; or the Pope was to give himself an infallibility he had not hitherto possessed, in which case he could change the divine constitution of the Church by his own plenary power; and if so, why summon a Council and ask its vote? President Bilio interrupted him, exclaiming, "You do not understand the first rudiments of the faith!" (Q., p. 663.)

Bishop Strossmayer wrote November 27, 1870 (reprinted in the *Koelnische Zeitung* of July 13, 1881): "The Vatican Council was wanting in that freedom which was necessary to make it a real council. . . . Everything which could resemble a guarantee for the liberty of discussion was carefully excluded. . . . There was added a public violation of the ancient Catholic principle, 'Always, everywhere, by all.' In a word, the most hideous and naked exercise of Papal infallibility was necessary before that infallibility could be elevated into a dogma. If to all this it be added that the Council was not

regularly constituted, that the Italian bishops, prelates, and officials were in a monstrously predominating majority, that the Apostolic Vicars were dominated by the Propaganda in the most scandalous manner, that the whole apparatus of that political power which the Pope then exercised in Rome contributed to intimidate and repress all free utterance, you can easily conceive what sort of *liberty*—that essential attribute of all councils—was displayed at Rome." (Littledale's *Plain Reasons*, p. 185.)

The teaching of the Pope's infallibility was forced upon the unwilling Roman church by the Jesuits, and "their Order is now really, and in the fullest sense, the Urim and Thummim and breastplate of the High Priest—the Pope—who can only then issue an oracular decree when he has consulted his breastplate, the Jesuit Order." (Q., p. 79.)

The Infallibility was carried by voters each of which represented 142,570 votes, while each of the minority represented 492,520. The minority fled from Rome the next day.

Cardinal Newman complained bitterly of this "insolent and aggressive faction" which had succeeded in fastening this doctrine on the Romish church and delaying the conversion of England for a hundred years. (Carson, p. 77.)

Antonelli said of the Jesuits, "These Fathers have a special talent for ruining whatever they touch." (Q., p. 113.)

The Jesuits are *grenadiers de la folie*, and unite imbecility with the vilest passions, said Lamennais, April 12 and June 25, 1830. (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 464.)

Though Cardinal Manning considered the Jesuits "one of the nine hindrances to the spread of Roman Catholicism in England," he was the "Monsignore Ignorante," the "Diabolus Concilii," who more than any other one man jammed the infallibility through the Council. (Sidney, pp. 97. 98. Purcell's *Life of Manning*, vol. II.)

Cardinal Schwarzenberg entreated the Council not to define infallibility, which would make the foundations of faith to tremble even in the devoutest souls. (Acton, *Hist. of Freedom*, p. 525.)

In Germany, in 1599, Jodocus Graes wrote to Baronius that the Jesuits had placed so many books on the *Index* that scholars could no longer safely use lexicons, compendiums, or indexes. Even the bishops were forbidden to read any book condemned at Rome. (Janus, p. 396.)

The Spaniard Alphonsus de Castro said: "It is notorious that many of the Popes know nothing of grammar, not to speak of the Bible. But one cannot decide on dogma without a knowledge of the Bible." (Janus, p. 406.)

The infallibility has no terrors and no difficulties for your good Catholic. It was a Jesuit saying, Prof. Erbermann's of Mainz: "The Pope can impart light, although blind, and even a wholly ignorant Pope can quite well be infallible, as God, we know, in old time led men on the right way by means of a mere ass." (Janus, p. 47.)

Why, yes, to be sure, so much so that in the Chamber of Baden, in 1872, a priest said, "The Pope cannot err, even if he desired to do so." (Hase I, pp. 309. 310.) If so, why, of course, "To attack Catholicism is just the same thing as to attack truth," as Perrone says in his *S. Pietro in Roma*.

"The Pope possesses the supreme and immediate dominion and jurisdiction, not merely over the Church in general, but over every individual Christian. Every baptized person is directly and immediately subject to the Pope, his ordinances, special commands, and penalties. . . .

"The supreme *magisterium* of the Church, *i. e.*, the Pope, whether alone or in union with a council, has to decide what Princes and Governments should do or leave undone in questions of civil society and public affairs.

"As the Pope possesses not only the supreme office of teacher, but also the supreme right of coercion and punishment, he not only distinguishes as teacher what is and what is not permissible for states and nations, but he can enforce his decision on political matters by penalties upon every one—be he monarch, or minister, or private citizen. . . .

"These ecclesiastical maxims, which deprive the laws of

the land of all force and of all obligation for the conscience, are partly those already in existence, partly those any Pope may issue hereafter whenever it pleases him. . . . Since Paul IV's time, 260 years ago, no Pope has so openly and undisguisedly spoken out the thoughts and wishes of his heart. The kernel of the doctrine, then, is this: There is on earth one sole lord and master over kings and subjects alike, over nations as over families and individuals, against whom no right or privilege avails, and whose slaves all are." (Q., pp. 268—271.)

1. Is it true that the admonition to Peter to confirm his brethren has always and in the whole Church been understood of an infallibility promised to all Bishops of Rome?

2. Is it true that this infallibility of all Popes has been taught and witnessed to in the whole Church through all ages down to our own day?

3. Is it true that no Pope has ever taught a doctrine rejected by the Church, and that no Pope has ever been condemned by the Church for this doctrine?

"It is impossible for any one who feels compelled by his own investigation of history to answer these three questions in the negative. . . . Public opinion will recognize only two alternatives in the case of those who submit, ignorance or dissimulation and falsehood. And the effect will be an immeasurable moral degradation of the Catholic clergy and a corresponding decay of their influence." (Q., pp. 486. 487.)

Archbishop Conolly of Halifax said: "Thrice have I asked for proof from Scripture according to its authentic interpretation, from Tradition, and from Councils, that the Bishops of the Catholic Church ought to be excluded from the definition of dogmas; but my request has not been complied with, and now I adjure you, like the blind man on the way to Jericho, to give us sight that we may believe. Hitherto we have recognized the strongest motive for the credibility of Catholic doctrine in the general consent of the Church notified through the collective episcopate; this has been our shield against all

external assailants, and by this powerful magnet we have drawn hundreds of thousands into the Church. Is this our invincible weapon of attack and defense now to be broken and trampled under foot, and the thousand-headed episcopate with the millions of faithful at its back to shrink into the voice and witness of a single man? Let the Deputation prove to us that it has really been always the belief of the Church that the Pope is everything and the Bishops nothing. The Council of Jerusalem did not adopt the formula of Peter but of John, who spoke before him, and in the Apostles' Creed we do not say, 'I believe in Peter and his successors,' but, 'I believe in one Catholic Church.' We Bishops have no right to renounce for ourselves and our successors the hereditary and original rights of the episcopate, to renounce the promise of Christ, 'I am with you to the end of the world.' But now they want to reduce us to nullities, to tear the noblest jewel from our pontifical breastplate, to deprive us of the highest prerogative of our office, and to transform the whole Church and the Bishops with it into a rabble of blind men, among whom is one alone who sees, so that they must shut their eyes and believe whatever he tells them." (Q., pp. 724. 725.)

Cardinal Jacobazzi, about 1530, said the Pope could hold an Ecumenical Council with one bishop only and issue an infallible decree. (Q., p. 340.)

The Pope *alone* can decide infallibly on all matters of faith and morals. (Vatican Council, Sessio IV, cap. 4.)—

So the faith of all the Romans depends on the weakness of a single man. The Romanist does not know what his faith is *now*, for he does not know when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra*. The Romanist does not know what his faith will be in the future, for he does not know what new teachings the Pope will publish. The Romanist does not know what his faith was in the past, for he does not know which of the infallible Popes he is to believe when they infallibly contradict one another.

Bishop Nausea of Vienna said of the Infallibility, "It

would be too perilous to make our faith dependent on the judgment of a single individual; the whole earth is greater than the city." (Janus, p. 380.)

Yes, quite perilous. The most eloquent speaker of the Catholic party in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies said: "Either every dogmatic utterance of the Church is true, or the whole Church is a fabrication." (Hase I, p. 74.) In the following we shall try to disprove the first part of the alternative and thus impale the Romish church on the other horn of the dilemma.

CONTRADICTIONS.

Pope Leo X in his *Bull* of 1520 against Luther said, "It is clear as the noonday sun that the Popes, my predecessors, have never erred in their Canons or Constitutions." (Hase I, p. 271.) Pope Pius IX in his *Syllabus* said, "The Popes have never exceeded the limits of their power."

The *Civiltà Cattolica*, "the faithful echo of the Holy See," proclaims to the world that every Pope is, ever has been, and ever will be infallible, *first*, when he teaches or maintains anything in any way connected with revealed truths of faith or morals; *secondly*, when he decrees anything affecting the welfare, rights, or discipline of the Church. (Q., p. 49.)

Janus gives repeated instances of Pope against Pope, Council against Council, Pope against Council, Council against Pope, with the authorities on which he rests his statements.

Pope Pius IX in a letter to Chigi, the nuncio at Paris, speaks of his infallibility as "that pious doctrine which for so many centuries nobody questioned." (Q., p. 667.) Cardinal Guidi declares it to be an invention of the fifteenth century. (Q., p. 712.)

The learned Roman Catholic Bishop von Hefele said, "I have studied church history for fifty years, but I have found in the early Church nothing about the infallibility of the Pope."

On November 11, 1870, he said, "The new dogma lacks a genuine traditional and Biblical foundation, and injures the Church in an incalculable manner, so that she has never sus-

tained a more harsh or deadly blow than on July 18th of this year."

"Nowadays one might argue about the Blessed Trinity with less danger of punishment than about the Pope's infallibility." (Hase I, pp. 320. 317. 319.)

The Roman Canon Law itself says: "If the Pope . . . leads countless people in troops to hell along with himself—hell's chief bond-slave—to be beaten with him for ever with many stripes: let no mortal presume to judge him, since he who is to judge all men is himself to be judged of none, *unless he be found deviating from the faith.*" (*Decret.* I, p. 40, 6. Littledale's *P. R.*, p. 17.)

St. Peter himself *corrected* the manuscript of Leo the Great.

In the *Liber Pontificalis*, the older part of which was composed in the sixth century, it is said of Euarestos, fourth bishop of Rome: "He appointed seven deacons who should keep watch over the bishop's preaching in order that the truth might be delivered." (Hase I, pp. 257. 260.)

Pope Adrian VI in his *Dictates on the Fourth Book of Sentences* says: "It is certain that the Pope can err even in matters of faith, asserting heresy in his determination or decree; for many of the Roman Pontiffs were heretics." This book was written when he was Professor at Louvain, but formally republished after he was Pope. (Littledale's *P. R.*, p. 213.)

St. Basil the Great has expressed most strongly his contempt for the writings of the popes, "those insolent and puffed-up Occidentals, who would only sanction false doctrine." He would not receive their letters if they fell from heaven. He was provoked by the support given at Rome to the open Sabellianism of Marcellus and the unsettling of the Antiochian Church. (Janus, p. 87.)

Pope Liberius signed an Arian creed and thus denied the deity of Christ, and he condemned as a heretic St. Athanasius, who defended the deity of Christ. St. Jerome writes: "Libe-

rius, overcome with the irksomeness of exile, subscribed to heretical error." St. Peter Damiani, in the eleventh century, speaks of Liberius as a heretic and an apostate. (Littledale's *P. R.*, p. 175.)

Pope Virgilius in 547 condemned Theodoret and Ibas as Monophysites; in 553 he withdrew his condemnation. He rejected the Fifth Ecumenical Council and was exiled by the Emperor Justinian; in 554 he accepted it. (Hase I, p. 263.)

The Roman Catholic Bishop Hefele showed that Pope Honorius was condemned as a heretic by the Sixth General Council for teaching Monotheletism in two public letters replying to formal application from three Eastern Patriarchs to him as Pope. Pope Leo II wrote to assure the Spanish Bishops that Honorius was certainly damned. The Seventh and Eighth so-called General Councils repeat the curses on the dead heretical Pope. This condemnation came into the confession of faith to which every Roman bishop down to the 11th century had to swear. (Hase I, p. 263; Q., pp. 455—457; Littledale, p. 175.) Dupin, the famous Doctor of the Sorbonne and Regius Professor of Divinity at Paris, in his *Compendious History of the Church* shows the same. (*Forefathers*, pp. 52—55; Sidney, p. 96; Man, p. 182.) Pope Honorius was cursed as a heretic by the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth General Councils.

Pope Virgilius was "separated from the Catholic Communion" by the North African Church.

Pope Liberius signed an Arian creed. (Carson's *Letters on Reunion*, p. 84.)

Pope Gregory I says the title "Universal Bishop" is "profane, superstitious, haughty, and invented by the first apostate; a blasphemous name; he that calls himself by that name in his pride is a forerunner of Antichrist." (Littledale, p. 177.)

Pope Boniface III took the title of "Universal Bishop," and the Pope does so to-day. (Vatican Decrees, "Const. de Eccl.," c. III.)

The Church deposed Popes John XII, Benedict IX, Gregory VI, Gregory XII, and John XXIII, the last in ex-

press terms as simoniac, sorcerer, schismatic, and heretic. (Littledale, p. 176.)

During the Schism from two to five rival popes were mutually calling each other Antichrist.

Pope Innocent I and Pope Gelasius I in the 5th century declared infants dying without the Holy Communion undoubtedly damned; the Council of Trent in 1564 condemned this monstrous doctrine.

Pope Nicholas in the 9th century decided valid a baptism in the name of Christ alone; Pope Pelagius in the 6th century had decided it not valid.

Pope Celestine III pronounced the marriage tie broken if one fell into heresy; later popes decided contrary. (McKim, pp. 125. 126.)

Pope Eugenius called the Cardinal of Arles that "adept in iniquity and son of perdition;" Pope Clement VII beatified him, "since his sanctity had been proved by miracles, and he had always led a heavenly, chaste, and blameless life." (Janus, p. 336.)

Archbishop Nicholas of Palermo (Panormitanus) at Basel taught: "In matters of faith the Council is above the Pope." John de Turrecremata: "The Council is greater than the Pope." Adrian VI, 1522—1523: "The Pope can err, even in that which relates to the faith." Bellarmine: "A pope as such can be, and can have been, a heretic." Pope John XXII was taxed with heresy by the Franciscans; the King of France wanted to burn him as a heretic; he recanted on his deathbed. (Hase I, pp. 268—272.)

Cardinal Jacob Fournier, afterwards Pope, thought papal decisions by no means final, but might be overruled by another Pope, and that John XXII had done well in annulling the offensive and doctrinally erroneous decision of Nicholas III on the poverty of Christ, and the distinction of use and possession.

Innocent III: "For other sins I acknowledge no judge but God, but I can be judged by the Church for a sin concerning matters of faith:"

Innocent IV allowed disobedience to a papal command that is heretical or threatening destruction to the whole Church, and that a Pope could err in matters of faith. (Janus, p. 273; Hase I, p. 266.)

The Council of Chalcedon expressly recognized Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa as orthodox; the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 553 condemned them as Monophysites.

The Council of Constance, 1414—1418, declared a general council above the Pope; the Fifth Lateran Council, 1512 to 1517, declared the Pope superior to a council.

Cardinal Peter d'Ailly said at Constance several universal councils had erred. "For according to some great doctors a general council can err . . . in matters of faith."

The canonized Archbishop Antoninus of Florence said in 1439: "A council also can err."

"It is absurd to believe that three-score ignorant bishops are in a better position, speaking from Trent, to guide the Church than the Vicegerent of Christ," said Pope Paul IV, when a decision displeased him.

Lainez said: "If it is said that the Council has been called together by the Holy Ghost, this means nothing else than that it has been called together by the direction of the Pope in order to deal with what shall be decided by the Holy Ghost with the approval of the Holy Father." Sarpi says no other saying has been more praised or censured.

A flippant speech of the French ambassador was that the Holy Spirit arrived in Trent each Friday from Rome in the mail-bag. At Rome they said, "The Holy Spirit does not like to cross the Alps."

Paul III in 1547 removed the Council from Trent to Bologna since their physician made oath to danger from the plague. The Emperor issued a manifesto setting forth that in the same time only two persons in Trent had died — a child suffering from its teeth, and an old woman who had none.

In 1590 Pope Sixtus V, "by the fullness of Apostolic power," made a *perpetual* decree that the edition of the Latin Bible, corrected by his own hand, "relying on the authority of the Prince of the Apostles," should be the sole authentic and standard text forever, and that any departure from it, even in *private* readings, discussions, or explanations, should incur the greater excommunication, while future editions not conformed to it should have no credit nor authority. It so swarmed with errors that it was called in almost at once, and in 1592 Pope Clement VIII published a new edition differing from the one of 1590 in several thousand places, and likewise issued under penalty of excommunication for changes. (Littledale, p. 182; *Forefathers*, p. 78.)

Dr. John, an eminent Romanist, says, Isidore Clarius collected 80,000 errors in the Vulgate, the Catholic Bible. (Van Dyke, p. 132.)

The earlier writings of Aeneas Sylvius, although as Pope Pius II he had recanted everything doubtful in them, were put on the *Index*, also the Commentaries of Erasmus on the New Testament, though Pope Leo X had solemnly approved them. Paul IV did not spare the scheme of reformation on which he had worked himself under Paul III. (Hase II, p. 431.)

In March, 1513, Leo X, prior to his election, took an oath to revoke the indulgences of Julius II, and to supply otherwise the money required for the building of St. Peter's. In March, 1515, Pope Leo X, after his election, broke his oath and revived the indulgences of Julius II for the building of St. Peter's. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 93.)

Henry the Navigator applied to Rome, and Nicholas V issued Bulls authorizing him and his Portuguese to make war on Moors and pagans, seize their possessions, and reduce them to perpetual slavery, and prohibiting all Christian nations, under eternal penalties, from trespassing on the privilege. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 53.)

Pope Gregory XIV in 1839 pronounced it unchristian

to hold slaves, and thus pronounced his predecessors unchristian. (B. Willard-Archer, p. 264.)

In 1687, Pope Innocent XI condemned as heretical the teaching of Michael de Molinos, known as Quietism; in 1864 Pope Pius IX beatified Margaret Mary Alacoque, who almost verbally reproduced the teachings of Quietism. (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 16.)

The Pope himself had invited Turkish intervention in Italy, and now declared it a cause of forfeiting the crown of Frederic of Naples. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 41.)

In the Massacre of St. Bartholomew the French Catholics butchered in cold blood from eighty to one hundred thousand French Protestants. The Spanish envoy wrote: "Not a child has been spared. Blessed be God!" Catharine de Medici said it had been in contemplation since 1562. Cardinals Santa Croce and Alessandrina prepared Rome for it. The Archbishop of Nazareth in 1570 told the Pope of the planned slaughter. Sorbin of Orleans, the Jesuit Auger, and others of the clergy were actual accomplices; the rest applauded. The Pope gave "energetic approval."

Montalto, Pope Pius V, thought so ill of his predecessor that he was tempted to revoke his best act, the reformation of the calendar; and he considered the massacre the height of folly as well as the worst of crimes. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 162.)

Pope Nicholas commended the Council of Basel as an assembly of men filled with the Holy Ghost; Pope Eugenius calls them "madmen, barbarians, wild beasts, heretics, miscreants, monsters, and a pandemonium." (Wylie, p. 196.)

Pope Paul IV issued the first Roman index of prohibited books. His successor denounced it at the Council of Trent as a bad piece of work. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, p. 120.)

Pope Alexander VI granted to Emmanuel of Portugal the dispensation Henry VIII asked for. Pope Julius II granted the same to Henry VII. Sixtus V declared Clement deserved his calamities for not having dissolved so unholy a

union. In 1523 Pope Adrian censured his predecessors for exceeding their powers.

Pope Clement was willing that Richmond, the son of King Henry VIII, should marry Mary Tudor, the daughter of King Henry VIII. He did not turn a deaf ear to the proposal of bigamy of King Henry VIII. For several years he continued to suggest that Henry should marry Anne Boleyn and renounce the quest of a divorce. In 1530 the Pope proposed that the king should live with Anne without marriage and without divorce. He required that the most compromising documents be kept secret. (Acton, *Lect. Mod. Hist.*, pp. 137. 140.)

Popes Innocent I, Zosimus, Boniface I, Leo I, Gelasius I, Gregory I, Boniface III, John IV, Innocent II, Innocent III, Honorius III, Innocent V, Clement VI, Eugenius IV, to whom may be added Leo X, Julius III, and Marcellus II, condemned the Immaculate Conception of Mary as *heresy*. Pope Pius IX, on December 8, 1854, decreed the Immaculate Conception of Mary. (Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 183.)

Canon VII of the General Council of Ephesus and the fifth session of the Council of Chalcedon condemned the teaching of any other faith and the making of any other creed; yet in 1564 Pope Pius IV issued a new creed. Pope Pius IX wrote in his *Syllabus* that it is a grievous error to say "that Divine Revelation is imperfect and therefore subject to a continuous and indefinite progress;" yet he invented the new dogmas of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 and of the Infallibility of the Pope in 1870. The development condemned by Pope Pius IX is just the development used by Cardinal Newman, taken from a German source, to explain the big difference between the New Testament and the present Roman Church.

Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis and Purcell of Cincinnati said, "We, and several more of us, believe that the dogma [of Infallibility] contradicts the history and tradition of the Church." (Q., p. 504.)

The infallible Pope Urban II decided that it is no murder to kill an excommunicated man out of zeal for the Church, a decision which to this day stands on record in 200 copies of the Canon Law. And Schrader says all 'papal decrees are infallible. Pope Leo X decided that every priest is absolutely free by divine and human law from all secular authority. (Q., p. 505.)

Archbishop Ginoulhiac of Lyons appealed to the words and example of former Popes who had acknowledged—like, *e. g.*, Celestine I, in 430—that they were not masters of the faith, but only guardians of the traditional doctrine, and that not singly, but in unison with all churches and their Bishops, as was clearly expressed in the decree. (Q., p. 744.)

Bishop Dupanloup at the Vatican Council said, "Pope Victor first approved of Montanism, and then condemned it. Marcellinus was an idolater; Liberius consented to the condemnation of Athanasius, and made a profession of Arianism that he might be recalled from exile and restored to his see. Honorius adhered to Monotheletism. Gregory I calls any one antichrist who takes the name of universal bishop; and, contrariwise, Boniface III made the parricide Emperor Phocas confer that title upon him. Virgilius purchased the papacy from Belisarius. Paschal II and Eugenius III authorized dueling; Julius II and Pius IV forbade it. Eugenius IV approved the Council of Basel and the restitution of the cup to the church of Bohemia; Pius II revoked the concession. Hadrian II declared civil marriages to be valid; Pius VII condemned them. Sixtus V published an edition of the Bible and commanded it to be read; Pius VII condemned the reading of it. Clement VII abolished the order of the Jesuits, permitted by Paul III; Pius VII reestablished it. If, then, you proclaim the infallibility of the actual pope, you must prove that which is impossible—that the popes never contradicted each other.—

"Baronius must have blushed when he narrated the acts of the Roman bishops. Speaking of John XI, natural son of

Pope Sergius and Marozia, he said, the Holy Church, that is, the Roman, has been vilely trampled on by such a monster. John XII, elected pope at the age of eighteen, was not one whit better than his predecessor. I am silent of Alexander, father and lover of Lucretia. I turn away from John XXIII, who denied the immortality of the soul and was deposed by the Council of Constance. This century is unfortunate, as for nearly a hundred and fifty years the popes had fallen from all virtues of their predecessors, and have become apostates rather than apostles." (*Bible Student and Teacher*, February, 1908.)

FORGERIES.

From the year 500 to 1600 deliberate fraud was at work in Rome and elsewhere for disseminating, supporting, and finding a basis for, the notion of infallibility. — The disreputable means employed for building up this system, by trickery and forgeries, are more and more brought to light. — Pope Leo X propounded downright forgeries and untruths to his Italian bishops, who had to call themselves an Oecumenical Council and dictated their votes. (Q., pp. 348. 164. 559.)

Cardinal Rauscher wrote that Papal Infallibility must extend to everything ever decided by any Pope, and the whole Christian world must hold with Boniface VIII and his Bull *Unam Sanctam* that the Popes have received power from Christ over the whole domain of the State. . . . That the Popes themselves in the ancient Church did not hold themselves infallible, . . . that the Popes have often fallen into open errors rejected by the Church — all this is well established. With Papal Infallibility the whole mediaeval theory of the unlimited power of Popes to depose kings, absolve from oaths of allegiance, abrogate laws, and interfere in all civil affairs at their will, must be declared to be immutable doctrine with which the Church stands or falls.

The Cardinal proceeds to dwell on the forgeries by which the great master of all Jesuits and ultramontanes, Thomas Aquinas, was led to adopt the doctrine of infallibility, and how again his influence shaped the whole scholastic system and drew

the great Religious Orders, who were bound by oath to maintain his teaching, to adopt it. (Q., pp. 452. 453.)

The second Letter of the famous Oratorian and member of the French Academy, Father Gratry, treats of the gross forgeries by which the way for the introduction of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility has been gradually prepared, first in the ninth and then in the thirteenth century; and dwells especially on the fact that the theologians—above all Thomas Aquinas, who rules in the schools, and his many disciples and followers—were deceived by these fabrications, and that even the Popes themselves were misled by them. Gratry's exposition is clear and convincing; but he goes beyond the Middle Ages. He shows how dishonestly the Breviary was tampered with at Rome at the end of the sixteenth century, and how, up to the present time, the Jesuits, Perrone and Wenninger,—the latter in a truly amazing fashion,—have followed the practice of citing fabulous or corrupted testimonies. (Q., pp. 249. 250.)

“Do you know, Monseigneur, in the history of the human mind, any question, theological, philosophical, historical, or otherwise, which has been so disgraced by falsehood, bad faith, and the whole work of the forgers [as Papal authority]? I say it again, *It is a question utterly gangrened by fraud.*” (Gratry, *Letter [II.] to Dechamps.*—Littledale, *P. R.*, p. 119.)

Gratry showed that the Roman theory is still propped by fables which were innocent once, but have become deliberate untruths since the excuse of mediaeval ignorance was dispelled; and he declared that this school of lies was the cause of the weakness of the Church, and called on Catholics to look the scandal in the face, and cast out the religious forgers. (Lord Acton, *Essays on Liberty*, p. 537.)

Ketteler printed that infallibility is an unscriptural and uneccelesiastical doctrine, and Scripture and Tradition do not justify its dogmatic definition. (Q., p. 730.)

The Bishop Legate of Trieste said plainly that the manipulations of Scripture texts, which were pressed into the service of the new dogma in glaring contradiction to the authentic

interpretation of the Church, was a sin. (Q., p. 739.) Archbishop Conolly of Halifax decisively maintained the doctrine of Infallibility to be untenable. (Q., p. 598.)

To Rome's favorite watchword, that dogma must conquer history, Verot of Savannah replied, "To me an ounce of historical facts outweighs a thousand pounds of your theories." (Q., p. 760.)

Bishop Strossmayer, on January 25, 1870, called the Canon Law a Babylonish confusion, made up of unpractical and, in most cases, corrupted or spurious canons. (Q., p. 169.) Again, "History cannot be made over again. It is there, and will remain to all eternity, to protest energetically against the dogma of Papal Infallibility."

Doellinger said, "As a Christian, as a theologian, as an historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine" (of the Infallibility). John Henry Newman said, "They have taken away our peace at Rome." Alfred von Reumont called the Vatican Council "A misfortune for the collective Catholic world, for the clergy, for the episcopate, for the Papacy itself." (Hase I, pp. 313. 323. 327.)

This spirit, which falsifies history and corrupts morals, is the crying sin of modern Catholicism.

The principles of the Inquisition have been most solemnly proclaimed and sanctioned by the Popes. Whoever maintains Papal Infallibility must deny certain radical principles of Christian morality, and not merely excuse, but accept as true, the opposite views of the Popes. Thus the Roman element excludes the Catholic and Christian. (Q., p. 445.)

Of the really clever men at the Vatican Council, nineteenth opposed the Infallibility. In Lord Acton's memorable words: "This is the picture of the Vatican Council, and of its own work, which we get from men like Schwarzenberg, Rauscher, Haynald, Ketteler, Clifford, Purcell, Conolly, Dupanloup, Darboy, Hefele, Strossmayer, and Kenrick. And so the Council stands self-condemned by the mouths of its ablest members. They represent it as a conspiracy against divine

truth and light. They declare that the new dogmas were neither taught by the Apostles nor believed by the Fathers; that they are soul-destroying errors, contrary to the true doctrines of the Church, based on deceit, and are a scandal to Catholics. Surely, no judgment could be less ambiguous, no language more open, no testimony more sufficient or decisive for the conscience of the faithful." (Sidney, p. 275.)

Where was the Infallibility before 1870? Some said, 1. in the Pope; others, 2. in the Church at large; still others, 3. in the General Council without the Pope; lastly, 4. in the General Council with the Pope.

Since 1870 Infallibility is in the Pope alone, when he speaks *ex cathedra*. But, when does he so speak? Cardinal Manning says the *Syllabus* of 1864 is part of "the infallible teaching;" Cardinal Newman says it is not. While the Jesuit preachers proclaimed that the *Syllabus* bore the full sanction of Infallibility, higher functionaries of the Court pointed out that it was an informal document, without official value. (Lord Acton, *Essays on Liberty*, p. 496. — Littledale; *P. R.*, p. 199.)

Lord Acton was not excommunicated, and he did not leave the Catholic church; he said he did not see why he should change his religion because the Pope had changed his, that the Pope, in fact, had become a heretic, whilst he still was orthodox. (Sidney, p. 92.)

The Catholic poet Coventry Patmore said of the Infallibility it was "merely the personal opinion of an amiable old gentleman, by which I am in no degree bound." (Sidney, p. 100.)

In sober fact, the defined dogma has to all intents and purposes been pigeonholed, so far as it has had any practical effect on the setting forth of the Christian revelation. (Carson, *Letters on Reunion*, p. 91.)

Cardinal E. H. Manning said, "The Council of Trent fixed the date after which Protestantism ceased to spread; the impending General Council (Vatican, Infallibility) will determine the date of its death." (Hase I, p. 282.)

On the 18th of July, 1870, Pope Pius IX declared the dogma of Infallibility; at the same time Napoleon's Eugenia declared "my little war" against Prussia; the French bayonets supporting the throne of Pio Nono were withdrawn. In about two months Victor Emmanuel ended the temporal power of the Pope, now the Vatican prisoner; on September 20, the Italian troops entered Rome through a breach in the walls near the Porta Pia. On the same day a cart laden with Bibles, driven by a Roman convert and accompanied by an agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, entered the Eternal City.

Coulanges said to an excited audience, "Do not think you are listening to me; you are listening to History!"

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

LUTHER AND LIBERTY.

A SYMPOSIUM OF EXPRESSIONS ON THIS SUBJECT TAKEN FROM
NON-LUTHERAN AUTHORS.

The Lutheran Church regards Luther as the divinely-sent liberator of the Church. Luther proclaimed the long-lost doctrine of justification by faith alone, the doctrine, that we are made free from sin, righteous, and heirs of salvation, not by the works of the Law, but by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith. This doctrine, restored to the Church by Luther, is the source of Christian liberty, of freedom from all human authority in matters of faith. Luther declared that Christ is the only Head of the Church, that He rules and governs His Church by His Spirit and Word, and that He has empowered no human being to impose laws on the Christian's conscience in spiritual matters. He also stood for total separation of Church and State, for a free and independent Church and a free and independent State, for freedom of conscience and worship, and *against* all external force and violence in matters religious.

Under the providence of God the work of Luther in behalf of Christian and religious liberty has also become the source

of secular and political freedom. The emancipation of civil governments from the blighting power of Rome, freedom of thought, and freedom of the press, are a remote but ripe fruit of Luther's Reformation. We may safely assert that there would be no *free* America with its *free* institutions, if Luther had not lived. "Luther and Liberty" is, therefore, an historically correct collocation of terms. "It is not, therefore, inexact to say that Luther was, in point of fact, the restorer of liberty to the ages which followed his era," says Michelet, the Roman Catholic but honest and conscientious historian. His is by no means an isolated expression of this kind. Such statements, made in just recognition of historical truth, are numerous. We have gathered a large number of similar expressions. They are all taken from non-Lutheran authors, Catholic as well as Protestant, and can therefore not be suspected of having been inspired by partiality. Having made use of some of them at different times and places where they were invariably heard with great interest and pleasure, and having been repeatedly requested to publish them, we now present these opinions to the readers of the QUARTERLY, in the hope that they will welcome them and find them to be useful.

James Bryce, the versatile political and historical writer and British Ambassador to the United States, says: "The monk of Wittenberg proclaimed [at Worms] to an astonished church and Emperor that the day of spiritual tyranny was past. . . . It [the Reformation] was in its essence the assertion of the principle of *individuality*—that is to say, of true spiritual freedom. . . . It became a revolt against despotism of every kind; it erected the standard of civil as well as of religious liberty." (*The Holy Roman Empire*. MacMillan and Co., New York, 1880, ch. XVIII, pp. 321. 328. 331.)

Prof. Williston Walker, D. D., of Hartford Theological Seminary writes: "He [Luther] was the pioneer of the road to spiritual freedom." (*The Reformation*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900, p. 77.)

The Very Rev. Principal *John Tulloch*, Scottish theolo-

gian and author: "What is known as Protestantism, or the theory of religious liberty, owes its birth to him [Luther]. . . . The courage of a single man as he faced on that great occasion [at Worms] 'the mailed chivalry of Germany' gave the courage which inspired the famous Protest [at Speyer, 1529], and laid the foundation of all Christian and ecclesiastical liberties." (*Luther and Recent Criticism. Nineteenth Century*, April, 1884, pp. 657. 660.)

Again: "This faith in a divine righteousness near to every soul made for itself a joyful way among the nations, and carried with it, wherever it went, liberty and strength. . . . It is impossible to conceive a more unqualified assertion of the right of private judgment—of the indefeasible privilege of the individual reason to know and judge the truth for itself" [than Luther's "magnanimous and always memorable words: 'Unless I be convinced by Scripture or by reason, I can and will retract nothing; for to act against my conscience is neither safe nor honest. Here I stand'"]. (*Luther and other Leaders of the Reformation*, by John Tulloch, D. D., Principal of St. Mary's College in the University of St. Andrews; one of Her Majesty's Chaplains for Scotland; 3d ed., William Blackwood & Sons, 1883, pp. 167. 171.)

The Athenaeum calls Luther "The extraordinary man to whom we are mainly indebted for the most valuable of all blessings—freedom of opinion." (No. 452, June 25, 1836, p. 444.)

Merle d'Aubigne (Reformed): "Luther was far before his age, and even before several other [?] reformers, on the subject of religious liberty." (*History of the Reformation*, p. 272.)

Bancroft, the most famous American historian: "Luther alone has the glory of forbidding to fight for the gospel with violence and death." (*History of the United States*.)

Eugene Lawrence, American author, born October 10, 1823: "It was the decisive moment of modern history. The mightiest intellect of the age was roused into sudden action;

the intellect whose giant strength was to shiver to atoms the magnificent fabric of papal superstition, and give freedom of thought and liberty to man. Luther rose up inspired." (*Harpers's*, June, 1869, vol. 39, p. 101.)

Rev. Kerr Boyce Tupper, D. D., LL. D., Baptist: "Truer words were never spoken than those of Martin Luther: 'Over the soul God can and will allow no one to rule but Himself.'" (Address given at Denver, Colo., 1893, on *America's Privileges and Perils*. *Homiletic Review*, vol. 27, p. 51.)

Rev. Edward J. Young, A. M., Cambridge, Mass.: "The humble miner's son, who was born on St. Martin's eve, and who became the leader of one of the most important movements of human history, will be forever remembered as having contributed more than any other individual to the civil and religious liberty of modern times." (Before the Massachusetts Historical Society, Nov. 8, 1883. *Proceedings of the Mass. Hist. Soc.*, vol. XX, p. 358.)

James Freeman Clarke, Unitarian clergyman and author, 1810—1888: "So stands Luther, growing more and more the mark of reverence through succeeding centuries,—the real author of modern liberty of thought and action." (p. 256.) "In spite of all sophistry and subtlety Luther will be regarded through all time as the champion of human liberty, and Loyola as that of human slavery." (p. 273 f.) (*Events and Epochs in Religious History*, 1880, pp. 256. 273 f.)

George William Curtis, American author and popular lecturer, 1824—1892: "In the truest sense Luther is the father of modern civilization. He emancipated the human mind from ecclesiastical slavery. He proclaimed that freedom of thought without which it is easy to see that, despite the great modern inventions, the spirit of the Dark Ages must have been indefinitely prolonged, and the course of modern civilization must have been essentially different. It was the spiritual freedom which Luther asserted that produced political freedom and the freedom of the press; Luther's spirit was to make the invention of Gutenberg the true servant of humanity, and to open to the

benign genius of liberty the lands to which Gioja's mariner's compass should point the way." (*Harper's*, Nov., 1883, vol. 67, p. 958.)

Rev. William M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D., (Presbyterian) pastor of Broadway Tabernacle, New York: "Luther stood for freedom of conscience, and thereby also widened the area of liberty in general. He asserted the equality of all men before God, in Christ, and out of that came at length, here and elsewhere, the Declaration of Independence, which affirms the equality of all men before human law. Had he flinched and recanted like Galileo, there would have been no such result. It is to the confessor of faith, and not of science, that we are indebted for the liberty we now enjoy." (At Luther Celebration, Academy of Music, N. Y., Nov. 13, 1883.)

Francois Auguste Marie Mignet, French historian, 1796 to 1884: "These three grand pioneers of modern progress gave to the human race—Columbus a new continent, Copernicus the law of the spheres, Luther the right of free thought. This last and most perilous achievement was the prize of an indomitable will. Summoned for four years to submit, Luther for four years said, No! He said to the legate, No! He said to the Pope, No! He said [at Worms] to the Emperor, No! That heroic and pregnant 'No!' bore within it the liberties of the world." (Translated by Hon. William M. Robbins.)

Jules Michelet, the brilliant French Catholic historian and essayist, 1798—1874, says in his *Life of Luther*, 1835: "Whatever sympathy, however, may be felt with this amiable and winning individuality of Luther, it must not be suffered to influence our judgment with reference to the doctrines which he, on all occasions, inculcates, or blind us to the consequences which are its necessary result. . . . It is not, therefore, inexact to say that Luther was, in point of fact, the restorer of liberty to the ages which followed his era. He denied it theoretically, indeed" ["He sacrificed free-will to grace, man to God, morality to a sort of providential fatality"!], "but he established it in practice; if he did not absolutely create, he at least courage-

ously signed his name to the great revolution which legalized in Europe the right of free examination. To him it is, in great measure, owing that we of the present day exercise in its plenitude that first great right of the human understanding, to which all the rest are annexed, without which all the rest are naught. We cannot think, speak, write, read, for a single moment, without gratefully recalling to mind this enormous benefit of intellectual enfranchisement. The very lines I here trace, to whom do I owe it that I am able to send them forth, if not to the liberator of modern thought? This tribute paid to Luther, we the less hesitate to admit, that our own sympathies are not with him in the religious revolution he operated." (*Life of Luther*, 1835, transl. by William Hazlitt. Bohn's *Standard Library*, London, 1904, preface, pp. XI. XII.)

John H. Treadwell: "That the principles of Martin Luther are the fundamental principles of our American Republic there can be no question. Surely, then, it is incumbent on us who have lighted the beacon of invitation to bid others come and enjoy with us liberty of person and conscience, to know him better." (*Martin Luther*, Putnams, 1889, preface, p. III.)

Benson J. Lossing, LL. D., the distinguished historical writer, 1813—1891: "In the heat of that conflict, which has continued ever since, have been evolved the representative government, the free institutions, and the liberty, equality, and fraternity which are the birthrights of every American citizen of whatever hue or creed." (*Our Country*. New York, Johnson & Miles, 1877, vol. I, ch. X, p. 117.)

The Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, American statesman and noted classic orator, particularly on historical themes, 1809 to 1894: "We are here to-day [Saturday, November 10, 1883] to recognize Martin Luther as, beyond all other men, the instrument of God in giving the impulse, by thought, word, and act, to that world-wide movement which resulted not merely in the reformation of Europe, but in all that we Americans now enjoy, and all that we rejoice in being. Pilgrim and Puritan,

Cavalier and Roundhead, Huguenot and Quaker, yes, and Roman Catholic also, consciously or unconsciously, all alike felt that impulse, and American colonization and the American Revolution were among its results. . . . No sectarian, or even merely Protestant, views enter into this commemoration. But we come as students of history, and in just recognition of historical truth, to hail the advent, and do grateful homage to the memory, and listen to the inspiring story, of a mighty instrument of God in awakening and rousing and reforming the world for all time and for all places beneath the sun; a man of indomitable courage and of unwavering faith in Christ, who kindled a flame of spiritual liberty never to be extinguished, but which is to burn brighter and brighter until the perfect day." (Introductory address delivered before the Massachusetts Historical Society at the Luther Celebration, Nov. 10, 1883. *Proceedings*, vol. XX, pp. 363. 364.)

The Rev. Dr. Frederic Henry Hedge of Harvard University, 1805—1891: "But this we may safely assert: that the dearest goods of our estate—civil independence, spiritual emancipation, individual scope, the large room, the unbound thought, the free pen, whatever is most characteristic of this New England of our inheritance—we owe to the Saxon reformer in whose name we are here to-day. . . . To Martin Luther, above all men, we Anglo-Americans are indebted for national independence and mental freedom. . . . It is from this point of view, and not as a teacher of religious truth, that he claims our interest. The Protestant Reformation, I have said, is not to be regarded as a mere theological or ecclesiastical movement, however Luther may have meant it as such. In a larger view, it was secular emancipation, deliverance of the nations that embraced it, from an irresponsible theocracy, whose main interest was the consolidation and perpetuation of its own dominion. . . . Honor and everlasting thanks to the man who broke for us the spell of papal autocracy; who rescued a portion, at least, of the Christian world from the paralyzing grasp of a power more to be dreaded than any temporal despotism,

—a power which rules by seducing the will, by capturing the conscience of its subjects,—the bondage of the soul! Luther alone, by faith and courage, by all his endowments,—ay, and by all his limitations,—was fitted to accomplish that saving work, a work whose full import he could not know, whose far-reaching consequences he had not divined. They shape our life. Modern civilization, liberty, science, social progress, attest the world-wide scope of the Protestant Reformer, whose principles are independent thought, freedom from ecclesiastical thrall, defiance of consecrated wrong. . . . Our age still obeys the law of that movement whose van he led, and the latest age will bear its impress. . . . Honor to the man whose timely revolt checked the progress of triumphant wrong: who wrested the heritage of God from sacerdotal hands, defying the traditions of immemorial time!" (Oration on Luther before the Massachusetts Historical Society, Nov. 10, 1883. *Proceedings*, vol. XX, pp. 365. 366. 382 f.)

The Hon. John Jay, American diplomatist, 1817—1894, United States minister to Austria 1869—1875: "It seemed fitting that this Alliance, on which has devolved in part the work of maintaining the great truths proclaimed by Luther, against the selfsame forces with which he contended, and against all other forces, foreign or domestic, which threaten our religious liberties and the purity of American institutions, should call on Americans to join with the rest of Christendom in commemorating the birth of the great Reformer. No country has more reason than this Republic to recall with joy the blessings he assisted to secure for the world, in emancipating thought and conscience, and in impressing the stamp of Christianity upon modern civilization. Although America had not been discovered by Columbus when Luther was born, Luther's far-reaching influence, which to-day is felt from the Atlantic to the Pacific, helped to people our Northern Continent with the colonists, who laid the foundation of its future liberties on the truths of the Bible." (At the Luther Celebration, Academy of Music, New York, Nov. 10, 1883.)

Arthur W. Kennedy: "He [Luther] saw the priceless heritage of personal religious liberty, and the idea set him in motion to blaze his way among mankind with this axe of truth." (p. 429.) "In this country the liberty which every man enjoys, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience so long as he preserves good order and the public peace, is a fruit of the Reformation." (p. 431.) "Luther's first aim was not a change in the political condition of the people; his teachings were all directed at abuses in the church and changes in theology, but as the church and state were so wedded and interlocked, how could it be otherwise that when Luther struck the blow that gave men religious liberty it gave them political liberty also? . . . If a man had liberty to think for himself in religion, he was now just as free to think for himself as a citizen in the state. Luther may not have anticipated such a result as this politically, for he was not a politician. He did not presume to serve as a statesman, and yet he did in the state what he, apparently, had no thought of doing, namely: he commenced a political reformation that has through the centuries run almost parallel with the religious reformation, and the political fruits are not the least among the great blessings that Luther's Reformation has conferred upon the world." (p. 533.) "On this foundation of principles [in the Declaration of Independence] our fathers built a superstructure and named it the United States of America, giving to liberty a new world, kindling a fire where it could not be extinguished—forming a new government on virgin soil, with political liberty as one of its cardinal doctrines. It was a ripe fruit of the Reformation. . . . For more than a hundred years this fruit of Luther's Reformation has been one of the choicest blessings that has come to America. . . . We see religious and political liberty, presented to the world by Luther." (p. 535. *Some Fruits of the Reformation. Chautauquan*, July, August, September, 1899.)

Daniel Webster, the great American orator and statesman, says in his Address at the Completion of Bunker Hill Monu-

ment, June 17, 1843: "The Reformation of Luther broke out, kindling up the minds of men afresh, leading to new habits of thought, and awakening in individuals energies before unknown even to themselves. The religious controversies of this period changed society, as well as religion. They changed man himself, in his modes of thought, his consciousness of his own powers, and his desire of intellectual attainment. The spirit of commercial and foreign adventure, therefore, on the one hand and, on the other, the assertion and maintenance of religious liberty, having their source indeed in the Reformation, . . . and this love of religious liberty drawing after it or bringing along with it, as it always does, an ardent devotion to the principle of civil liberty also, were the powerful influences under which character was formed and men trained for the great work of introducing English civilization, English law, and what is more than all, Anglo-Saxon blood, into the wilderness of North America." (Works, 7th ed., 1853, vol. I, p. 94.)

Bancroft: "But it was not then possible in Europe to reconstruct the church on the principle of its total separation from tradition and the state. Did Luther look to the newly discovered world as the resting-place of his teachings? He certainly devised and proposed the rules for emigration. When the great revelation of truth was made, 'a star,' said he, 'moved in the sky, and guided the pilgrim wise men to the manger where the Savior lay.'¹ He advised the oppressed country people, taking with them the preacher of their choice and the open Bible, to follow 'the star' of freedom to lands where religious liberty could find a home." (*History of the United States of America*. Boston, Little, Brown, & Co., 1875, vol. X, p. 78.)

Again: "The earth, wrapt in thickest darkness, sighed for the dawn. The son of a miner, of the peasant class in Eisleben, trained in the school of Paul of Tarsus and the African Augustine, kindled a light for the world. He taught that no man impersonates the authority of God. . . . 'There is but one master, and his name is Christ in heaven;' and, collecting all

1) *Ermahnung zum Frieden auf die zwölf Artikel der Bauerschaft.*

in one great formulary of freedom, he declared: Justification by faith; by faith alone, 'sola fide.' . . . The principle of justification by faith alone solved every problem. It is freedom against authority; self-activity against superstitious trust in other men. It was the knell of the departing dominion of an alien prince over the conscience of the peoples. . . . Well, therefore, did Leibnitz say of Luther: 'This is he who, in later times, taught the human race hope and free thought.' . . . Further; he demanded that truth should be spread by appeals to reason alone. 'If fire,' said he, 'is the right cure for heresy, then the fagot-burners are the most learned doctors on earth. Nor need we study any more: he that has brute force on his side may burn his adversary at the stake.' 'I will preach the truth, speak the truth, write the truth, but will force the truth on no one; for faith must be accepted willingly, and without compulsion.' . . . On the right of private judgment, Luther said: 'If the emperor or the princes should command me and say: "Thus and thus you ought to believe," then I speak: "Dear emperor, dear princes, your demand is too high;" they say: "Yes, you must be obedient to us, for we are the higher powers." Then I answer: "Yes, you are lords over this temporal life, but not over the eternal life;" they speak further: "Yes, peace and unity must be preserved; therefore you must believe as the emperor and princes believe." . . . No, dear emperor, dear prince, dear lord, dear lady, it does not belong to you to make such a demand.' And again: 'All bishops that take the right of judgment of doctrine from the sheep are certainly to be held as murderers and thieves, wolves and apostate Christians. Christ gives the right of judgment to the scholars and sheep. St. Paul will have no doctrine or proposition held, till it has been proved and recognized as good by the congregation that hears it. Every Christian has God's Word, and is taught of God and anointed as a priest.' It followed, as the rule for all Christendom, that the teacher, 'the minister of the Word,' should be elected by the congregation itself." (L. c., pp. 74—77.)

Hon. William H. H. Miller, Attorney-General in President Harrison's cabinet from 1889 to 1893, said: "We cannot claim for our Anglo-Saxon ancestors any special preeminence as champions in the great tournament of freedom. Romance with all the grand figures of its Lancelots, its Arthurs and its Ivan-hoes, furnishes no picture of such heroic courage, moral and physical, as Martin Luther nailing his theses, his declaration of the right of private judgment, to the door of the Church in Wittenberg, or standing in the hostile presence of the Emperor of Germany and his magnificent array of Kings, Princes, and Barons, in the Diet of Worms, and to the demand that he recant announcing: 'I cannot and I will not recant a single word.' If it be said that the contest of Luther was for religious rather than civil liberty, the ready answer is that civil and religious liberty are inseparable; that one cannot live when the other dies." (Address given in Connecticut, July 4, 1892. *Luth. Quart.*, Oct., 1892, vol. XXII, p. 549.)

James Anthony Froude, the greatest English historian of recent times, wrote in 1884: "The Bible to him [Luther] was the sole infallible authority, where every Christian for himself could find the truth and the road to salvation, if he faithfully and piously looked for it. . . . Luther hated lies. But he was against violence, even to destroy falsehood." (*Luther*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884, pp. 42. 76.)

Edwin D. Meade, the eminent Unitarian of Boston, says in his *Martin Luther*: "Luther has done more than any other man ever did to emancipate the human mind from usurped authority. . . . When the flood of his inspiration is upon him, Luther declares the right of private judgment and freedom from all external authority with the same emphasis and fullness with which the prophet of to-day would speak. . . . Luther's mighty hammer fell upon the bell that knelled at once the death of priest and pope, and rang in, to an enslaved and thirsty nation, the gospel of original relations with God once more. . . . If he had one conviction firmer than others, it was that the sword should never be used in propagation of the truth. 'It is

through the Word, and not by force,' he loved to say, 'that wisdom governs.' 'I will preach, I will talk, I will write,' he said, 'but I will not use force or compulsion with any one.'"
(Martin Luther, a Study of the Reformation. Boston, Geo. H. Ellis, 1884, pp. 61. 137. 153.)

William Cullen Bryant:

At last the earthquake came — the shock that hurled
 To dust, in many fragments dashed and strown,
 The throne, whose roots were in another world,
 And whose far-stretching shadow awed our own.
 From many a proud monastic pile, o'erthrown,
 Fear-struck, the hooded inmates rushed and fled;
 The web, that for a thousand years had grown
 O'er prostrate Europe, in that day of dread
 Crumbled and fell, as fire dissolves the flaxen thread.

(The Ages, stanza XXIII.)

St. Louis, Mo.

C. F. DREWES.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

John 1, 14: *The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.*

The Word was made flesh (incarnation; two natures, one person),

and dwelt among us (during the state of humiliation);
and we beheld His glory (rays of glory in the state of humiliation),

the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father (eternal generation; equality with God),

full of grace and truth (purpose of incarnation).

Kaì ò λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. "And the Logos, the Word, became flesh." Who is this Word? "The Word was God," v. 1, Jesus Christ, v. 17. So the sentence is equivalent to: The Son

of God became flesh. *Flesh*, σὰρξ, by synecdoche — pars pro toto — means *man*, the *human nature*. Hence, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο says: The Son of God became *man*, assumed the *human nature*. Text and context loudly proclaim this mystery, and the parallel passages substantiate this sublime fact beyond a doubt. In 1 John 4, 2; 1 Tim. 3, 16; Hebr. 2, 15 we read: the Son of God ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, *is come into the flesh*; ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, *was manifested in flesh*; σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος . . . μετέσχεν, *of flesh and blood He took part*. Four simple words: "The Word became flesh" — and yet they declare the mystery of mysteries, the cardinal fact of Christianity, the incarnation of the eternal Logos. What a contrast: *God* and *man*! The Logos assumed the impersonal human nature into His already existing divine person. This is called the *personal union*. The Son of God became a true and perfect man, uniting our human nature with His divine nature. So in Him there are two natures; but still there is but one Person — one Person who is God as well as man. This union of the two natures in Christ is one of the greatest mysteries of the Christian religion. St. Paul exclaims: "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh," 1 Tim. 3, 16.

This God-man, says St. John, "*dwelt*," tabernacled, tented, "*among us*." The Son of God became a man, like as we are, sin excepted. He dwelt among us, He was in our midst, we ate with Him, we conversed with Him, we went in and out with Him. He was true man. He hungered, Matt. 4, 2; He experienced thirst, John 19, 28; weary of the day's journey, He sat down on Jacob's well, John 4, 6; on the storm-tossed ship He slept, Matt. 8, 24; He wept over the death of His friend Lazarus, John 12, 35. In brief: He "was made in the likeness of men, and was found in fashion as a man," Phil. 2, 7. And yet this man was unlike other men in one respect. He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and higher than the heavens." His opponents, the Jews, He met with the defiant challenge: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" Christ was a man without sin. Outwardly, to all ap-

pearance, He was but a man; but He was a man withal that possessed divine majesty. During the time that He dwelt visibly among us, says St. John, "*we*," i. e., St. John and the other disciples of Christ, "*beheld*," ἐθεασάμεθα, *we discerned*, we saw with wonder and amazement, "*His glory*." Glory, δόξα, is the aggregate of all divine attributes in which God manifests Himself, such as holiness, love, truth, omniscience, omnipresence, omnipotence. This glory they beheld in Christ. It was *His* glory, not one delegated to Him by the Father. In the state of humiliation Christ was very God. Of this glory, which was His own and communicated by the divine nature to the human, Christ did not make use at all times, but only when it pleased Him. In His words, in His miracles, at the Transfiguration, and in His Passion, rays of this divine glory flashed out from time to time. He *saw* the faith of the paralytic; He *saw* the evil thoughts of the Pharisees; He *saw* Nathanael under the fig tree; "He knew what was in man." At the marriage festival at Cana of Galilee He performed the miracle of changing the water into wine, and, we read, He "*manifested forth His glory*;" He raised the widow's son, and they beheld His glory; He stilled the angry tempest on the Galilean sea, and they beheld His glory; Lazarus was called forth out of the grave by Christ's omnipotent voice, and they beheld His glory; with the words, "It is I," He felled His captors, and manifested forth His glory. With wonder and amazement Christ's disciples saw again and again: This man Jesus is omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient! This man is God!

Of this glory St. John says it was "*the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father*." The only-begotten Son He was, and therefore of the same essence with the Father, very God of very God, and as such He needs must possess glory, full, unlimited, divine glory. The essence of God and the glory of God are inseparably united with each other. — Kenoticism is rationalism pure and simple. According to this heresy, Christ, when assuming human nature, abandoned certain divine at-

tributes, such as omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence. He did not only not use them, say the Kenotists, but He did not even possess them. Hofmann, for example, goes so far as to say in one place: "He ceased to be God in order to become man." Thus this mystery concerning the God-man, which the Bible teaches so plainly, but which we cannot fathom, is flatly denied. Deny the omniscience of Christ, or His omnipotence, or His omnipresence, and you deny His divinity. In our text, St. John plainly teaches, though Christ became *man*, He still remained what He was before — *God*.

RESUME. — Christ is the God-man. God He is from all eternity; man He became in time. There are two natures in Him, personally united so as to constitute one person. From this personal union follows the communication of the natures and from this again the communication of attributes. Subsequent passages may lead us to enter upon the latter topics more fully.

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

MATT. 16, 18 f. AND THE PRIMACY OF PETER.

Protestant commentators of Matthew very generally inscribe the section which begins at the thirteenth and terminates at the twentieth verse of the sixteenth chapter: "The Confession of Peter." This caption makes the action of Peter related in this section more prominent than the action of Christ. If considerations of the dignity of the speakers and of the weight and import of the remarks of the speakers on the occasion were allowed to determine the phrasing of the head under which a commentator sets out to discuss the record of the event in the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, we might expect a chapter-head somewhat like this: "The Elevation of Peter." For as regards rank, authority, and personal worth, the Galilean fisherman is far inferior to the God-man, and while the testimony which Peter utters in behalf of his Master is cer-

tainly a magnificent encomium on the true character of the Master, still the acknowledgment which the Master makes to His disciple and, above all, the eminent and unusual distinction which He bestows upon him, might incline us to place the weight of the entire episode on vv. 17—19 rather than on v. 16. That the theologians of the Roman Church claim that this ought to be done, goes without saying. But whether, in an effort to briefly characterize the contents of this particular section in Matthew's account, we ought to place Peter's confession of Christ (σὺ εἶ χλ., v. 16) or Christ's confession of Peter (σὺ εἶ χλ., v. 18) in the foreground, will be seen in the last analysis to be a very small matter. Both statements are remarkable, striking. The impartial Protestant will not hesitate to say that words were spoken to Peter on this occasion which distinguish him above the rest of the disciples. That is an impression which the most perfunctory as well as the most searching investigation of the text will yield. On the other hand, the Catholic will have to grant that the remark of the Lord to Peter requires as its logical *prius* the confession of Peter; that if Peter had not spoken as he did, it is not likely, and we have no ground for assuming, that the Lord would have spoken to Peter as He did. After all, the great question is not, Who spoke best? but, What did each say? In particular, it is the scope and the force of the remarks of the Lord to Peter that require to be pondered in the text and context, and if anything like the primacy of Peter as conceived by the Roman Church is found to be laid down here, Scripture in general will have to be appealed to, and history will have to be called upon for its witness, to substantiate the claim.

After four centuries of the most exacting toil upon this text in Matthew on the part of the best scholars on either side of the question, a writer at this late day must not only feel exceedingly timid, but he might almost be seized with a feeling of despair, when deciding for himself the question of the usefulness of saying another word upon the matter, after so much has been said and nothing of what has been said seems to

have made the least impression. Rome is to-day just as vociferous and just as determined in its asseverations that Matt. 16, 18, 19 is the Magna Charta of the papacy and the hierarchy, as it was in the days of the Reformation. Only recently her priests in our country boasted that this text establishes "the Holy Father" as the visible head of the Christian Church throughout the world; and there may be not a few Catholic laymen who sincerely believe that this text settles forever the question of the spiritual and secular supremacy of Rome, and that those who oppose the papacy are found to be fighting not against a device of men but against an ordinance of the Lord. On the other hand, the effect which the words of Christ had in determining the station and rank of Peter may be said to have been expressed by modern Protestantism in a style somewhat different from that in which Germany, Scandinavia, England, and Helvetia voiced their convictions after 1520; still modern Protestantism has not yielded one essential point to the champions of Peter's primacy, the successorship of the bishop of Rome to Peter, and his vicegerency to Christ. The positions assumed by theologians on either side have become rigid, impervious to argument; the combatants have passed the point where it is still possible to impress or sway an opponent. Modern Protestant effort, accordingly, can hope for little more than by reiterating the findings of its forbears to confirm its posterity in a protesting attitude over and against the exclusivism and intolerance of the Church of Rome which is being cloaked by this text; and once in a while it may hush an overconfident declaimer on the divinely ordained supremacy of the Pope.

The controversy turns virtually on two points: 1. whether *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ* (v. 18) refers to the person of Peter; 2. whether *σοὶ* (v. 19) carries a sufficient emphasis to cause the grant made to Peter in this clause to be the sole and exclusive privilege of Peter.

As to the first point, the entire context in which the words occur favors an affirmative answer. Both in the preceding

clause and in the clause beginning with *δώσω*, which follows almost immediately, Christ addresses Peter: "Thou art Peter;" "I will give thee;" "thou shalt bind;" "thou shalt loose." It is not easy to conceive how the clause *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ οἰκοδομήσω κτλ.*, "upon this rock I will build my Church," could have been addressed intelligently to any other person than to Peter, to whom the entire statement is addressed. Moreover, there is undoubtedly a connection intended by the pronoun *ταύτῃ*; it points to something that has just been referred to; and it cannot point to anything else than to Peter, for to him the Lord had referred. The paronomasia *Πέτρος—πέτρα* plainly describes the same personage. "The demonstrative *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ κτλ.*, following as it does upon the statement *σὺ εἶ Πέτρος*, can only refer to the apostle, just as the clause following (*καὶ δώσω*) refers to him." (Meyer—Weiss.)

But if Christ meant to declare Peter the foundation of His Church, why did He not, after acknowledging the fitness of the name bestowed on this apostle at the time of his call (John 1, 42), proceed to say simply: *ἐπὶ σου οἰκοδομήσω*, "on thee I will build," etc.? The reference to the person of Peter would thus have been made much plainer. The apostle's personality is referred to in this context in two distinct ways: the apostle is Simon Barjonah and he is Peter. Simon Barjonah is no *πέτρα*, Peter is. If the terms "person," "personage," "personality" are understood merely in the sense of "human individual" and connoting existence and personal identity, the same as other members of Jonah's family and other citizens of Bethsaida possessed, we are justified in saying that *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ* does not refer to the person of the apostle. But if "person" points to the human being who had come under the regenerating influence of the teaching of Christ, the phrase does refer to the person of Peter. It is not the *ἄνθρωπος σαρκικός* but the *ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός* that Christ addresses in His apostle. Naturally the apostle was unfit for any such purpose or mission as the Lord connects him with; but he had been fitted for it supernaturally. The apostle was in one view the

product of Jonah, in another, the product of the Father in heaven. From Jonah he had *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα*, and all that characterizes the natural condition of man in his relation to spiritual things, ignorance of, enmity toward, God and divine matters. From the Father in heaven he had knowledge to grasp, faith to embrace, courage and cheerfulness to own, the Redeemer-God, manifest in the flesh. The earthly father had produced a fisherman, the heavenly, a confessor. It is the latter individual that Christ addresses. He views the apostle not in his secular, cosmic, but in his spiritual capacity. "The name Simon Bar Jonas is doubtless used as indicating his fleshly state and extraction, and forming the greater contrast to his spiritual state, name, and blessing which follow. The name 'Simon, son of Jonas,' is uttered when he is reminded by the thrice repeated inquiry, 'Lovest thou me?' of his frailty in his previous denial of the Lord." (Alford.) "The statement *σὺ εἶ πτλ.* is not merely a repetition of the statement *σὺ κληθήσῃ Πέτρος*, 1 John 1, 43, but a sequel to it: it asserts that Peter is now become what was on the former occasion only anticipated for him, that he who according to his flesh and blood was only *Σιμων βαρ Ἰωνᾶ* is now become a new man, a *πέτρα*, on which Christ Himself promises to build His future Church." (Noesgen in Strack-Zoeckler.)

The age in which Peter confessed Christ the Son of the living God was tossed with doubts, vacillating between various opinions as to who and what Christ was. Some thought this, others that (v. 14). Men of such uncertain views, of such unclarified judgments, of such undecided beliefs were no material suitable for the construction of the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ is the congregation of men who acknowledge the divinity, the perfect coequality with God, of the humble, lowly, serving Man who traversed Palestine proclaiming salvation by faith in His teaching and work. Christ holds to these people a relation that is variously described in Scripture: He is their Head, they are His body; He is their Shepherd, they are His sheep; He is the Vine, they are the

branches. In all these figurative delineations of the connection between Christ and His believers there is a common element: Christians cannot be conceived of apart from Christ. They are what they are only through Him. In the text before us Christ claims a share in bringing about the great spiritual metamorphosis which made out of Simon Barjonah a Peter; for He quietly reminds Peter that the Father, to whom Peter was indebted for his knowledge of the Son of Man and for his alacrity in confessing Him, is His Father, *ὁ πατήρ μου*. The faith which Peter held rested on this very Christ whom he professed. And here we think of another manner in which Scripture exhibits the relation between the Lord and the believer, that between a building and its foundation. The believers are the temple of God, Christ is the foundation of the temple. This foundation is the general and universal foundation of the faith of every believer, and it is impossible to lay any other, 1 Cor. 3, 11. It is not the act of believing but the object which a believer appropriates, embodies, so to speak, in his new spiritual individuality, that imparts strength, solidity to him, and makes him fit material to be entered into that holy, invisible temple of God, constructed out of living stones (1 Pet. 2, 5), of which Pétér speaks to the Christians who had learned from him to believe in Christ. *Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ*, then, refers indeed to Peter, but only as he was firmly grounded upon the *fundamentum fundamenti*, the nethermost Rock that bears up Peter and all whom Peter is to evangelize and disciple, the Lord Christ Himself. While it must be acknowledged that there is an element of equality between *Πέτρος* and *πέτρα*, it must be granted just as well that there is an element of inequality. *Πέτρος* and *πέτρα* are not absolutely identical. Not the mere, bare human individual Peter, but the characteristic quality in the individual Peter which deserves to be designated as *πέτρα* is the subject of the remark *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ κτλ.* "Jesus says: *Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ*, plainly referring to the name of Peter. But by using the feminine *πέτρα* for the masculine *πέτρος* and by placing *ταύτῃ* alongside of it, Matthew effects

a distinction between the person of the apostle and that which makes the apostle a rock, and the latter element is credited to that knowledge which he had received by revelation. It was because this distinction had to be made that the Lord did not simply say ἐπὶ σου. Besides, the express statement that his knowledge had not sprung from his σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα declares that it was not his personality that made Peter a rock-man (a fact which the history of his life clearly corroborates), but something that had been implanted in him by God." (Noesgen in Strack-Zoeckler, who thus declines contrary views of Weiss, Holtzmann, Weizsaecker, Schanz, Knabenhauer.) "By his profession Peter had uttered the fundamental confession of the Church, hence had laid its foundation. (?) Upon *this* confession, accordingly, Jesus proposes to build His Church. The declaration of Peter, 'Thou art,' etc., is answered by Jesus in a similar declaration to Peter, 'Thou art,' etc. Hence, not the man Peter, Jonas' son, is the foundation, but Peter the confessor, Peter in or by his confession." (Tholuck.) The remark of Tholuck, "Peter had laid the foundation," is explained by the context of this author's remarks. It cannot mean anything else than that Peter, being established himself upon the foundation that had been laid, was now qualified by his testimony to bear up the faith of future members of the Church, was now, and whenever he would repeat his witness for Christ in the future, a part of the θεμέλιος ἀποστόλων, Eph. 2, 20, on which the entire Church rests, with Jesus Christ Himself the chief corner-stone. The sole distinction of Peter is that which priority in confessing Christ before others secures. It was shared later by the other apostles.

It has been suggested that Christ accompanied the words ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ with a gesture: some would have the Lord, while uttering these words, point His finger at Peter, others at Himself. It is not probable that the Lord did either, but in a popular representation the latter view has many things to commend it as a means to facilitate the understanding of the passage. Christ certainly is the Rock on which the Church

has been built, and Peter and the apostles and other men may become the foundation of the faith of their fellowmen only in so far as they proclaim Christ and lead men to faith in Christ. "All Christians are Peters by reason of the same profession which Peter makes. This profession is the rock on which Peter and all Peters are built up." (Luther.)

2. The claim of the Roman Church in behalf of Peter's primacy cannot be established from v. 18. But does not v. 19 prove it? That the personal pronoun *σοί* carries no emphasis, even a person of rudimentary knowledge of Greek rhetoric is able to see. To express emphasis it would have had to be given a different place in the clause, or be accompanied by qualifiers having exclusive force. As it stands in the text it is colorless. But even if one should grant that a certain stress goes with this pronoun, that could easily be accounted for by the circumstances of the occasion. The grant of power, however, conveyed in the clause beginning with *δῶσω* cannot be construed into an exclusive Petrine authority, because exactly the same grant is made to all the apostles Matt. 18, 17—19 and John 20, 22 ff. The contents of this power are part and parcel of the apostolic qualification for the evangelization of the world; the bestowal of this authority creates a person not a bishop of any one particular church, but a householder, a steward of the Church of God in general, an apostle.

If any one was in a position to gather from the words of Christ that import which the Roman Church has gathered from them, it would have been Peter himself and his fellow-disciples. We should, accordingly, expect to see Peter asserting and exercising, the other apostles acknowledging and deferring to, his superior authority. There is no evidence in the entire New Testament that Peter was conscious of the fact that Christ had created him Primate of all the world. The controversy which unsanctified ambition caused to spring up among the disciples after Peter's confession, when they were wrangling for the first place in the kingdom of Christ, Matt. 18, 1. 4; Luke 22, 24, is conclusive evidence that the first place, as far

as they knew, had not been given away. The rebuke which Christ administered on that occasion had the force of a declaration that there would be no "first place" in the sense which they connected with that phrase. And that sense is the sense of the ambitious Roman Church. Throughout the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles we find the servants of Christ treating each other as on a perfect equality; they are called pillars of the Church, but they do not call Peter *princeps apostolorum*. The primacy of Peter is a later invention. It may cause us to smile when we hear the higher critics of our day declare that this text in Matthew must be a spurious interpolation of a late redactor, because it betrays hierarchical influence and represents the first definite indication of a papistic ambition. But we can understand how a critic who works mainly with hypotheses can adopt this one. Certainly, if the text means what Rome claims and what Wernle and Holtzmann seem ready to grant, we should have in this text something so utterly out of harmony with, yea, so contradictory to, the rest of the New Testament, that we might be tempted also to think of a Roman interpolation. But there is no fault to be found with the text; to set forth its plain import and scope is tantamount to upsetting every claim of the papacy, without even calling to our aid the formidable facts of history which antagonize a Roman episcopate of Peter as much as Scripture antagonizes his primacy.

"They cite against us certain passages, viz. (Matt. 16, 18 sq.): 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.' Also: 'I will give unto thee the keys.' Also (John 21, 15): 'Feed my sheep,' and some others. But since this entire controversy has been fully and accurately treated of elsewhere in the books of our theologians, and all things cannot be reviewed in this place, we refer to those writings, and wish them to be regarded as repeated. Yet we will briefly reply concerning the interpretation of the passages quoted. In all these passages Peter is the representative of the entire assembly of apostles, as appears from the text itself. For Christ asks not

Peter alone, but says: 'Whom do ye say that I am?' And what is here said in the singular number: 'I will give unto thee the keys; and whatsoever thou shalt bind,' etc., is elsewhere expressed in the plural (Matt. 18, 18): 'Whatsoever ye shall bind,' etc. And in John 20, 23: 'Whosoever sins ye remit,' etc. These words testify that the keys are given alike to all the apostles, and that all the apostles are alike sent forth. In addition to this, it is necessary to confess that the keys pertain not to the person of a particular man, but to the Church, as many most clear and firm arguments testify. For Christ, speaking concerning the keys (Matt. 18, 19), adds: 'If two of you shall agree on earth,' etc. Therefore He ascribes the keys to the Church principally and immediately; just as also for this reason the Church has principally the right of calling. [For just as the promise of the Gospel belongs certainly and immediately to the entire Church, so the keys belong immediately to the entire Church, because the keys are nothing else than the office whereby this promise is communicated to every one who desires it, just as it is actually manifest that the Church has the power to ordain ministers of the Church. And Christ speaks in these words: 'Whatsoever ye shall bind,' etc., and means that to which He has given the keys, namely, the Church: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name' (Matt. 18, 20). Likewise Christ gives supreme and final jurisdiction to the Church, when He says: 'Tell it to the Church.'] Therefore it is necessary in these passages that Peter be the representative of the entire assembly of the apostles, and for this reason they do not ascribe any prerogative, or superiority, or lordship to Peter. As to the declaration: 'Upon this rock I will build my Church,' certainly the Church has not been built upon the authority of man, but upon the ministry of the confession which Peter made, in which he proclaims that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. He accordingly addresses him as a minister: 'Upon this rock,' *i. e.*, upon this ministry. [Therefore He addresses him as a minister of such an office as is to be pervaded by this confession and doctrine, and says:

‘Upon this rock,’ *i. e.*, this declaration and ministry.] Furthermore, the ministry of the New Testament is not bound to persons and places, as the Levitical ministry, but it is dispersed throughout the whole world, and is there where God gives His gifts, apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers; neither does this ministry avail on account of the authority of any person, but on account of the Word given by Christ. And in this way most of the holy Fathers, as Origen, Cyprian, Augustine, Hilary and Bede, interpret this passage (Upon this rock). Chrysostom says thus: “Upon this rock,” not upon Peter. For He built His Church not upon man, but upon the faith of Peter. But what was his faith? “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” And Hilary says: ‘To Peter the Father revealed that he should say, “Thou art the Son of the living God.” Therefore the building of the Church is upon this rock of confession; this faith is the foundation of the Church,’ etc.” (Art. Smalcald. III, 22 ff., p. 342 f.)

MISCELLANY.

A Lutheran Letter to President Roosevelt with Comment.

(*Concluded.*) In our last issue we noted important actions of church bodies and utterances of editors on the above letter. Additional material of great value has come to hand since which evinces the intelligent and cordial appreciation with which the letter of the Lutheran Conferences of New York and of Philadelphia has been received throughout the country.

On December 9, 1908, *Der Christliche Apologete*, organ of the German Methodist Church, noted the sophistical reasoning against the Lutheran letter of protest, which a speaker at the late Catholic Missionary Congress had adopted, and which was declared by the *New York Freeman's Journal* one of the greatest orations delivered during the Congress. The Methodist editor said:

Nothing is more certain than that this Republic must prepare for a long, stubborn, and bitter fight with this historic enemy of

true Christianity, of the open Bible, and of human liberty. The weapons of Rome are not to be despised. They are strong and dangerous, because they are weapons of insincerity and earthly; they are derived from the Prince of Darkness and are forged at the forge of the father of lies. There are no dialecticians more skilled, no sophists more cunning (*i. e.*, men who by their false logic and specious representations darken truth and confuse people), than those trained to maturity in the schools of Rome.—The fact must not be concealed from the evangelical Christians of America that the Church of Rome is plotting to achieve nothing less than the gradual but final and complete subjugation of this country to the scepter of Rome. In striving to attain this end this political church-power proceeds without any scruples whatsoever.

On December 10 *The Lutheran Witness*, official organ of the English Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri and other States, published the entire New York letter, and remarked editorially:

We feel justified in assuming that the letter of our New York brethren to President Roosevelt and the endorsing communication from the General Council pastors, as found in another column, will be read with more than ordinary interest. The danger to our free institutions from the machinations of the Romish hierarchy is real and is imminent. That the Romanists are sitting high in the councils of the nation is evidenced by an incautious remark of Cardinal Gibbons. This crafty head of the Romish Church in this country does not usually uncover his tracks, but when the President's letter was published, he could not resist the temptation to say with boyish boastfulness: "I knew it was coming out." One can only express surprise that the Cardinal so far forgot ordinary prudence—but this is not the first time that the show of the cloven hoof has spoiled a clever game.

The interest that the letter has aroused is nothing less than remarkable, and noteworthy endorsement has come from unexpected quarters all over the country. Our readers will do well to preserve the text of this letter and make it known in their circles of acquaintanceship.

Succeeding issues of this church-paper have again and again championed the New York letter, and among the English Lutheran papers of this country *The Lutheran Witness* may be said to have done yeoman's service in laying bare the per-

nicious scheme of popery and fairly compelling Protestants to see the danger that is now upon us.

The *Christian Observer* (Presbyterian) of Louisville, Ky., in its issue of December 9 published an answer to President Roosevelt's letter to Mr. Martin by a Catholic priest, G. V. Fradryssa of Mobile, Ala. The letter does not take notice of the Lutheran missive, but is very valuable testimony on the crucial point in the controversy of the Lutheran pastors with the President.

The *Lutheran Evangelist* of December 10 remarked:

Our Christian President, whose sincerity of purpose will be questioned by none who know him, is receiving with quietness the strong reminders that came to him not only from Lutherans, but from Protestants of other names as well, that we must draw the line at the ballot box when the papal Hierarchy asks our votes. *The Evangelist* need not reiterate its key-note in this vigorous protest in which Protestants of all faiths are substantially a unit. So long as the Vatican stands by its historic claim of papal supremacy, — the Pope, the Vicar of Christ, to whose supreme authority alone all of us bow, — so long the American people will not elect a Roman Catholic to the Presidency. That God has a people, dear to Him and to us all, in the Roman Catholic Church, none of us question; but we will never acknowledge the unscriptural and un-American claim of the Vicarship of the Roman Pontiff. We are not surprised that our good and sensible President makes no reply to the protests that reach him from many influential quarters. There is a time to answer and a time to be silent.

On December 15 the news of the political controversy that had broken out in this country were proclaimed even in Germany. The New York correspondent of the *Koelnische Volkszeitung* in a lengthy letter rehearsed to his readers in Germany the main contents of the letter, minimized its importance, and called the request of the Lutherans that the President would qualify his remarks on bigotry arrogant.

Lutherisches Kirchenblatt, official organ of the Lutheran Iowa Synod, in its issue of December 17, repudiated the President's charge as going too far, reproduced a portion of the New York letter, and summarized the rest, with evident approval.

Harper's Weekly (December 5) had referred to the Lutheran letter, giving a correct summary of its contents, but placing its remarks under the caption "Anti-Catholic Prejudices." The *Young Lutherans' Companion* of December 19 took issue with the editor, as follows:

My dear editor Harvey, do you call that liberty of thought and speech in a free land? The editor had to give the Romanist a salve for his wounded heart! The truth of the Lutheran letter is recognized in plain words, but the whole question is headed "Anti-Catholic Prejudices"! Do our young Lutherans see livingly the tremendous force of that situation? American journalism trembles already before Rome. Journalists in America, "the land of the brave and the home of the free," are already willing to call the truth their reason and their conscience recognize as truth by the name of "prejudice," to please Rome. Is that religious liberty? Is that political freedom? Is that American? Is that the fruit of all the struggles of the Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, and every other movement of liberty in modern times? Or is it the awakening echo of the Medieval times, when Rome burned, flayed, sawed asunder, tore into pieces, boiled, encased in iron frames, buried in lime-pits in the cellars of the Church's Inquisition palaces all that did not believe as the Pope commanded?

Shame, George Harvey, for this servile fear before an enemy of the truth! And God help us Lutherans to a more sturdy Biblical faith and earnest Christian life, that we may have the power to confess our faith, our Christ, our Gospel, our principles, in the face of all the stress and press of Rome upon our heaven-born liberties in Church and State.

On January 8 a conference of Lutheran ministers in Southern Indiana (Missouri Synod) met in Indianapolis and passed resolutions which were published in the *Indianapolis News*, as follows:

Whereas, His Excellency, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, has made the charge of unwarranted bigotry against any one who might refuse to vote into high office a Roman Catholic; and

Whereas, It is an undeniable fact that the separation of church and state, one of the chief corner stones of our Republic, is condemned as a most pernicious doctrine by the Roman church; and

Whereas, A loyal Roman Catholic who fully understands the

allegiance required of him by the Pope can never sincerely subscribe to the Constitution of the United States; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That we cordially indorse the protest addressed by our brethren, the Lutheran ministers of New York City, to the President and published in the *New York Times* on the 16th of November, 1908. We emphasize the following facts:

Pope Boniface VIII, in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*, declared:

In this church and in its power are two swords, to-wit, a spiritual and a temporal, and this we are taught by the words of the Gospel. Both, therefore, the spiritual and the material swords, are in the power of the church, the latter indeed to be used for the church, the former by the church, the one by the priest, the other by the hands of kings and soldiers, but by the will and sufferance of the priest. It is fitting, moreover, that one sword should be under the other, and the temporal authority subject to the spiritual power. We, moreover, proclaim, declare, and pronounce that it is altogether necessary for salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman pontiff.

Cardinal Gibbons says:

The Roman Catholic church is not susceptible of being reformed in her doctrine. (*Faith of Our Fathers.*)

Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Humanum Genus* (April 20, 1884), condemns freedom of conscience and freedom of worship.

As eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, we deem it our duty, on purely patriotic grounds, to sound a warning, lest the grave danger to which our President seems to be blind be ignored by our fellow-citizens, and our Government pass into the hands of enemies of our religious freedom.

On the same date a press dispatch from Baltimore brought the following information:

The dissatisfaction rife among the Protestant denominations over President Roosevelt's letter, published a short time ago, in which he expressed the opinion that the time would come when the people would lay aside what he called "narrow bigotry" and elect to the presidency of the United States men of any religion, Catholic or Protestant, or of no religion at all, took definite shape at the meeting of the Methodist Episcopal ministers of the city. Strong resolutions, drawn up by a special committee, were adopted, attacking the President's position and indorsing the reply made to his letter by the Lutheran ministers of New York.

The Roosevelt letter was brought before the Methodist ministers at their regular meeting, which is held in the Eutaw Street church, two weeks ago. After some discussion it was at that time referred to a committee of five to properly frame the sentiments of the meeting in resolutions.

The following remarks of *The Westminster* were transferred to the *Lutheran Evangelist* of January 21:

We are not sectarian, and would never try to limit the individual liberty of any man. If a man wants to be a Roman Catholic, let him. So long as he serves God and obeys the law, and makes no effort to subordinate State and Church, we have no quarrel with him. But here is our position: The doctrine of a free church in a free State is fundamental with Protestantism. The doctrine of the Holy Roman Empire, a union between Church and State, close and eternal, is the fundamental doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, and this union is to have for its head the Holy Father in the Eternal City. Rome dominated Europe until Luther's hammer broke the chain. If the time should ever come when Rome should become dominant in Washington in the person of a man as forceful, as resourceful, as insistent as Mr. Roosevelt has been, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Church and State would be felt in American life. We do not wonder the Lutherans cry out against the President's action. We do not wonder that the President declines to answer their letter. He probably knows when he is beaten, and their letter is in our view unanswerable.

Partly to chronicle the event and partly because the matter may be of some service to others whenever a like occasion is presented to them, we present the action of our brethren of the Indianapolis Conference on the subject of "moral legislation":

The following resolutions have been adopted by the German Lutheran Ministerial Conference of Indianapolis and vicinity:

"Whereas, we are continually being annoyed by requests of the Prohibitionists and anti-saloonists to enlist our Lutheran congregations in favor of legislative action against manufacture and sale of beverages containing alcohol; and

"Whereas, on the other hand, our German Lutheran congregations are being represented among legislators as having declared themselves for the repeal of the county option law, passed in the recent special session of the Legislature,

"Be it known to all that these legislative questions have not been mentioned, much less discussed or resolved upon in our church meetings, and no petitions for or against the repeal of the county option law will be issued by our church bodies or their officers.

"Our members, as far as their membership in our church is concerned, are absolutely free to work for or against the bills which aim to allow and control, or to restrict and even forbid the sale of alcoholic beverages. We can think of one contingency only which would affect our churches and call for their resistance as church bodies, namely, if the use of wine in the Lord's Supper were to be prohibited by law of the State.

"Furthermore, having in mind the very frequent use of the Bible on the floors of the Legislature (not to speak of some astounding interpretations of Scripture), we offer the following principles, which are in thorough harmony with the Bible as well as with the Constitution of our dear country:

"1. It is not the province of the State and civil legislation to deal with sins of any kind as transgressions of the law of God, *i. e.*, the moral law of the Bible. The civil government must attempt the correction of the 'malum civile' only, the public wrong, whereby the civil rights and temporal welfare of individuals or communities are endangered or infringed.

"2. Proper civil legislation being the first and fundamental measure toward the protection of society and its members, it is the duty of every one who has a share in the exercise of the legislative power of the State to contribute his due share toward the enactment of such laws as will best serve the purpose of the State.

"3. The form and substance, however, of such legislative enactments are not to be determined by the Bible, the Word of God, but by the dictates of human reason, as found in those whose duty it is to contribute toward or assist in such enactments.

"4. In the legislative Assembly a member thereof does not represent his church or religious denomination, but all citizens of his district regardless of their religious convictions or affiliations. He should not attempt to inject the religious views of his church and pastor, nor even his own religious convictions, into the bills presented for enactment by himself or other members of the Assembly.

"5. Thus a conscientious legislator, under certain circumstances, might assist in the passage of a law which permits within the community of the State what God has forbidden to His Christians in the kingdom of His Son, Christ Jesus. Where the Senator or Representative was, by the dictates of reason and his best private judgment, moved to assist in such legislation, he should not be condemned by his church associates; nay, he ought to be commended for his mental capability of distinguishing between church and state.

"6. It is the duty of every citizen to obey the valid enactments of civil legislation, while in force, even though he may consider them

unwise, yea, detrimental to the public welfare. If he be an officer, he is bound to enforce even such laws. To countenance the non-enforcement of such laws is not civic righteousness, and must naturally breed a disregard for the observance of other laws, thus gradually bringing about a general corruption of public official life, aye, a universal lawlessness. It will be proper, however, for law-abiding citizens and officers to seek an early opportunity for amending or repealing the statutes which experience has proved to be ineffective or harmful.

"The foregoing principles are general, applying to enactments on marriage, divorce, usury, civil contracts, Sunday base-ball, sales of alcoholic liquors, and to every other legislative subject.

"In the name of the German Lutheran Conference of Indianapolis and vicinity,

"P. SEUEL, *President*.

"R. D. BIEDERMANN, *Secretary pro tem.*"

BOOK REVIEW.

PASSIONSPREDIGTEN von *H. Sieck*, ev.-luth. Pastor, Merrill, Wis.
Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1909.
Price, 50 cts.

A triple series of Lenten discourses is offered in this book by an author whose homiletical proficiency has been successfully exhibited on previous occasions. Each series consists of six sermons: the first expounds the vicarious feature of the sufferings of Christ; the second depicts the sufferings themselves; the third accompanies the Redeemer on His way of sorrows to the place of crucifixion. All the texts are from the synoptic Gospels. An appendix containing three sermons, one from a prophetic and two from apostolic texts, sets forth the fruit of Christ's passion. The sermons are all able testimonies to the power of the cross of Christ, and the simplicity and ease of the author's style are not their least merit.

DIE PFLICHT CHRISTLICHER ELTERN GEGEN IHRE KINDER, mit
Ruecksicht auf die Verhaeltnisse unserer Zeit und un-
sers Landes in einem Synodalreferat dargestellt von
Pastor R. Miessler. Concordia Publishing House,
St. Louis, Mo. 1908. Price, 35 cts.

This treatise of 144 pages is a reprint of the doctrinal paper submitted to the Kansas District at the conventions of 1904, 1906, and

1907. It is a very able, timely, and helpful discussion of the evils of American family life. The truths uttered in this treatise are such as every American father, mother, and educator ought to hear and ponder.

CONCORDIA-KINDERCHOERE. Eine Sammlung von Liedern in vierstimmigem Satz fuer unsere Schulen und Sonntagschulen. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 40 cts.

These two hundred and fifty hymns for use in schools and Sunday schools are a valuable addition to our treasury of songs. Twenty-eight of the hymns are English. The book opens up with a form for opening the Sunday school. The hymns from No. 1 to No. 123 are arranged according to the order of the ecclesiastical year. Hymns 124 to 138 have for their theme the means of grace; 139 to 158 are hymns addressed to the Redeemer; 159 to 170 are songs of praise and thanksgiving; 171 to 195 relate to phases of the Christian life; 196 to 210 express the hope and longing of Christians for heaven; 211 to 240 are songs concerning nature, the seasons, patriotic songs, etc. The book is concluded with a form for closing the Sunday school and a number of closing hymns. We trust that the book will gain access and become a favorite also in the family circle, and aid, as it is well able to do, in enlivening, embellishing, and fructifying the social intercourse of our Christians at their homes.

MISSIONSFESTLIEDER, gesammelt von *Pastor H. Bouman*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1908. Price, @ 5 cts.; per dozen, 40 cts.; 100 copies, \$2.50.

Thirty German and seven English hymns for use at mission festivals are here offered. Liturgical matter (antiphones and collects) has been added at the end of each part. The dearth of hymns of this sort in our hymn-book has suggested the collection, and the difficulty of many of our pastors and congregations to find suitable hymns for their annual mission festival and to have them in a form ready for distribution may now be regarded as relieved. We suggest that the tune for hymn No. 36 be changed to "From Greenland's Icy Mountains," and that the original versification of eight lines to the stanza be retained.

LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM. With Short Explanations and a Few Bible Verses. For Very Busy People. By *William Dallmann*. Second Edition. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. 1908.

The THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY expressed its estimate of, and esteem for, this Catechism in a nutshell vol. XII, No. 3, p. 191. The second edition contains very slight changes in seven places, mostly additions to the matter offered in the first edition, and all of them improvements. As the book goes into the hands of children, we trust we will not be considered finical for pointing out the one erratum on p. 27 ("peculier"). The price, we presume, remains the same, 10 cents.

AUXILIARIUM. Predigtentwuerfe aus der fuenfzigjahrigen Amtszeit des seligen *Pastor C. Gross* sen. Dargeboten von seinen Soehnen, *C. und E. M. Gross*. Erstes Heft. 1908. Address Rev. C. Gross, Kurtzville, Ont., Canada, or Rev. E. M. Gross, Greeley, Colo. Price, 45 cts., postpaid.

The late Rev. C. Gross was considered a very able sermonizer in his day. Those who heard him, and those who read his published sermons, bear witness to the clear exposition and forceful application which he knew how to give to his text. It appears that during the few years which he spent as a retired minister before his departure, he was engaged in collecting, and arranging for publication, his sermon notes. He was called home before the work of publication was begun. His widow and two of his sons now offer these notes, which are to appear seriatim in pamphlet form and under the title chosen by the deceased himself. The present issue contains ninety outlines, divided into two parts. The first part (56 pages) offers useful sermon material for the Sundays, beginning with the First Sunday in Advent and ending with the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany, partly on the pericopes, partly on free texts. The second part (40 pages) contains pertinent texts, ably outlined, for particular occasions, initial sermons, confessional addresses, for days of penitence and for Thanksgiving Day. — The enterprise deserves the patronage of the clergy.

THE RECENT EARTHQUAKE. Sermon preached by *Rev. R. Jesse*, January 10, 1909. To be had of the author for 10 cts., at 1607 N. Euclid Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This sermon from Amos 3, 6 was called forth by the catastrophe which overwhelmed Messina, and by infidel remarks of a Jewish rabbi on the same, to whom the author replies.

GOLDENES JUBILAEUM DES LUTHERISCHEN HOSPITALS ZU SAINT LOUIS, Mo. 1909. Address Mr. F. Grote, 1116 Park Ave., St. Louis, Mo. Price, 5 cts.

Rev. R. Kretzschmar and assistants narrate, in song and story, the remarkable history of the Lutheran Hospital of St. Louis, in a jubilee edition of the well-known *Kranken- und Waisenfreund*. Text and illustrations of this edition are calculated to incite to gratitude and renewed zeal in the charitable work of caring for the sick.

THE TRAINING OF CHILDREN. The substance of two sermons on Prov. 22, 6. By *Otto C. A. Boecler*, Pastor. Grand Rapids, Mich.

The reader will find himself amply repaid for his perusal of this tract.

LUTHERWORTE' UEBER SCHULE UND RELIGIONS-UNTERRICHT. Zwickau i. S. Johannes Herrmann, Publisher. 1908. Address Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 5 cts.

This tract of 16 pages reacts against the anti-Lutheran spirit which dominates the Saxon Teachers' Association. This body has, at its late convention in Zwickau, rejected Luther's Catechism as the basis for the religious instruction of children. The ablest and most impressive remarks of the Reformer on the Christian schooling of children are here offered in handy form.

CHURCH AND STATE. A Reply to President Roosevelt's "Narrow Bigotry" Letter of November 8, 1908. By *William Dallmann*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 1909. Price, 5 cts.

The demands for an edition in pamphlet form of Rev. Dallmann's stirring article in our last issue have been so numerous and so in-

sistent that the publisher has acceded to what is, no doubt, a public and general demand. The reviewer congratulates both the readers of the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY and the publisher upon their good judgment; for Rev. Dallmann's formidable collection of facts as to what the State may expect from "*the Church*" is proving a poser to the Roman hierarchy, and it is wonderful to behold the egg-dance performed by men like Cardinal Gibbons, who undertakes to gyrate between the Constitution of the United States and the bulls and encyclicals of popes without striking either his loyal or his orthodox foot against the one or the other. We bespeak for Rev. Dallmann's tract the widest circulation.

THE POPE IN POLITICS. By *William Dallmann*. Second Edition. Milwaukee, Wis. 1909.

The crushing testimony which the author has accumulated in this little tract of 14 pages makes it "clear that the Roman Catholic religion is un-American, and that in his 'narrow bigotry' letter President Roosevelt is un-American."

EV.-LUTH. DOGMATIK. Von *Dr. theol. Adolf Hoenecke*, weiland Direktor und Professor am Seminar der Allg. Ev.-Luth. Synode von Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan u. a. St. zu Wauwatosa, Wis. Bd. II. Die eigentliche Dogmatik. 1. Lieferung. Zum Druck bearbeitet von seinen Söhnen *Walter und Otto Hoenecke*. 1909. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. Price, 40 cts.

The title of this publication, together with the name of the author, are sufficient to arrest the attention and to arouse the interest of every Lutheran theologian. The publication is a posthumous work of the sainted Dr. Hoenecke. A publisher's prospectus gives information regarding the genesis of this work, as follows: "For years the members of the General Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and other States had entertained the wish that Dr. A. Hoenecke, professor and director at the theological seminary at Wauwatosa, Wis., who died January the third, 1908, might publish his dogmatic lectures. Dr. Hoenecke acceded to this wish, which was voiced particularly by his many pupils. He was on the point of preparing his lectures for publication, in fact, he had for years been occupied with this arduous task, when the Lord summoned him from

his labors before he had completed them. Lest the work thus begun remain uncompleted, and the oft-repeated wish of many persons in our circles unfulfilled, the sons of the deceased have undertaken to complete their father's work and publish it. A committee, consisting of Prof. A. Ernst of Watertown, Prof. J. Koehler of Wauwatosa, and Rev. C. Gausewitz of Milwaukee, was appointed to assist them. The publication was taken in hand by the Publishing House of the Synod." "The publication begins with dogmatics proper, with theology (in the strict sense). It is not necessary to state the reason why the publication does not begin with the Prolegomena. The reason is this: The author was engaged on a revision (*Neubearbeitung*) of the Prolegomena and on expanding the material of this chapter by an additional history of the Prolegomena, when God called him from his labor. However, he left extensive notes covering the uncompleted part of his work. These must now be worked out, and that only to give to the complete work that degree of perfection which the author had intended. That is the reason why the publication begins in the middle of the work. The notes, when fully elaborated, will be submitted to the editing committee for criticism, and will be marked 'uncompleted by the author' in the published edition of the work. The entire work will be concluded with an exhaustive index. The first number is now ready for mailing. It is presumed that one number of 80 pages will be issued every other month, and the entire work will comprise about 20 numbers, and require three years for its completion."

In the number before us the author indicates first the division of the entire dogmatical material, which he proposes to treat under three main heads: Theology, Anthropology, Soteriology. Next the author takes up the doctrine of God, which is presented in six chapters: On the Knowledge of God, On the Existence of God, On the Essence and Attributes of God, On the Holy Trinity, On the Works of God, On the Ministers of God, the Angels. Of these chapters the first and second are offered complete in the present issue, and the third chapter has been carried forward as far as the immanent attributes of God, among which the thesis on the immutability of God is begun in this number. Each chapter is subdivided into paragraphs, and each paragraph into theses, thus: Chap. I. On the Knowledge of God. § 2. On natural knowledge of God. Thesis I. Natural knowledge of God is the conviction implanted in human reason and capable of development by means of the contemplation of the divine works, that God exists and that He governs all things created by Him with wisdom, power, and justice. Thesis II. Natural

knowledge of God, neither in its innate nor in its developed form, is sufficient for the attainment of salvation. § 3. On supernatural knowledge of God. Thesis I. Supernatural knowledge of God is the saving knowledge of God bestowed upon faith by the Spirit through the revelation of God in His Word. Thesis II. The distinction between natural and supernatural knowledge relates to their basis (*principium*), their essence (*forma*), and their purpose and effect (*finis et effectus*). § 4. On the limits of the knowledge of God. Thesis: A perfect knowledge of God, or one which fully comprehends the essence of God, is attained neither by natural nor by revealed knowledge of God. Chap. II. On the Existence of God. § 5. On the value of the arguments for the existence of God. Thesis: While the arguments in favor of the existence of God are not of such force as to compel any atheist to acknowledge the existence of God, and while in a strict view of the matter they are not required by Scripture as a part of Christian dogmatics, nevertheless we give an account of them in dogmatics, partly because they belong to the conventional dogmatic material, partly because they are not altogether useless. § 6. The principal arguments in favor of the existence of God. Thesis: The existence of God is established either from experience, or from the nature of existing things, or from the concept of God, or from the nature of the human mind. From experience we obtain the historical argument. From the nature of existing things we reason either backward to their origin or forward to their purpose, and thus obtain the cosmological and the teleological argument. From the concept of God we obtain the ontological, and from the nature of the human mind the moral argument. Chap. III. On the Essence and Attributes of God. § 7. On the essence of God. Thesis I. The description (definition) of the essence of God must be drawn from Scripture and must be rendered in terms agreeable to the same. Thesis II. In the briefest form we may describe the essence of God according to Scripture, in the following terms: God is the infinite, unconditioned Spirit. § 8. The attributes of God. Thesis I. In reality, the attributes of God are not something distinct from God and His essence, but in truth and reality they are one and the same thing as the essence of God. Thesis II. Among the many existing classifications of the attributes of God that one commends itself as best which divides them into immanent and transitive attributes. Chap. I. The Immanent Attributes of God. § 9. The immutability of God. Thesis: When predicating immutability of God we maintain that the essence of God, together with all the perfections contained therein, is forever one and the same and remains

identical with itself, and that any change in God as to His being, willing, and thinking is excluded.

In the discussion of these theses it becomes apparent that the author is a scholar of extensive reading, that his reading has been critical, and that he has formulated a careful judgment of the force and tendency of the statements of ancient, medieval, and modern dogmaticians. The older Lutheran dogmaticians he treats, throughout this number, as trusted guides. §§ 4—6 contain a Lutheran critique of the leading philosophical systems by which it has been sought to influence, modify, or supplant the Scriptural findings of the dogmatician.

We readily confess to a keen sense of delight while perusing this initial number of the first genuine Lutheran *Dogmatik* published in America and emanating from an American theologian. It is, of course, impossible at this early date to essay even a tentative judgment of the work as a whole; but the contents of the first installment are promising in such a high degree as to cause one to look forward with eagerness to the forthcoming sequels, and to wish both the editors and the publisher Godspeed in their painstaking efforts.

A SONG OF FAITH. By *Christian Jonathan Oehlschlaeger*.
A Lyric Poem in Four Books and Twenty Cantos. New
York. Cochrane Publishing Co. 1908. 303 pages.
Price, \$2.15 postpaid.

The printer and binder have done their best in giving to this volume a very attractive appearance. The author strives in this book to tell the story of the conquest of Christian faith over every error. This story has been told before in a style more intelligible to the general public; but that is no reason why it should not be told again in poetic form and with allegorical ornamentation. In the First Book the author's theme is, "The Simplicity of Faith;" in the Second, "Light in Darkness;" in the Third, "From Darkness to Light;" in the Fourth, "The Triumph of Faith, Hope, and Love."

Received from *The National Druggist*, St. Louis, Mo., "The Machinations of the American Medical Association. An Exposure and a Warning." By Henry A. Strong.
